



# भारत का राजपत्र

## The Gazette of India

प्राधिकार से प्रकाशित

PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

साप्ताहिक

WEEKLY

सं. 18] नई दिल्ली, अप्रैल 27—मई 3, 2014, शनिवार/वैशाख 7—वैशाख 13, 1936

No. 18] NEW DELHI, APRIL 27—MAY 3, 2014, SATURDAY/VAISAKHA 7—VAISAKHA 13, 1936

भाग में भिन्न पृष्ठ संख्या दी जाती है जिससे कि यह पृथक संकलन के रूप में रखा जा सके

Separate Paging is given to this Part in order that it may be filed as a separate compilation

भाग II—खण्ड 3—उप-खण्ड (ii)

PART II—Section 3—Sub-section (ii)

भारत सरकार के मंत्रालयों (रक्षा मंत्रालय को छोड़कर) द्वारा जारी किए गए सांविधिक आदेश और अधिसूचनाएं

Statutory Orders and Notifications Issued by the Ministries of the Government of India  
(Other than the Ministry of Defence)

### गृह मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 23 अप्रैल, 2014

का०आ० 1299.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, राजभाषा (संघ के शासकीय प्रयोजनों के लिए प्रयोग) नियम, 1976 (यथा संशोधित, 1987) के नियम 10 के उप नियम (4) के अनुसरण में गृह मंत्रालय के निम्नलिखित 10 कार्यालयों में हिन्दी का कार्यसाधक ज्ञान रखने वाले कर्मचारियों की संख्या 80% से अधिक हो जाने के फलस्वरूप उन्हें एतद्वारा अधिसूचित करती है:—

- के०आ०सु० बल 7वीं आरक्षित वाहिनी किश्तवाड़ (जम्मू एवं कश्मीर)
- के०आ०सु० बल इकाई आर०एच०पी०पी० पिपरी (उत्तर प्रदेश)
- के०आ०सु० बल इकाई पीपीसीएल-III बवाना (नई दिल्ली-39)
- के०आ०सु० बल इकाई आईजी मिन्ट नोएडा (उत्तर प्रदेश)
- के०आ०सु० बल इकाई डीएचईपी धौलीगंगा (उत्तराखण्ड)
- के०आ०सु० बल 9वीं आरक्षित वाहिनी देवली (राजस्थान)

- के०आ०सु० बल इकाई शेप सेवा-II (जम्मू एवं कश्मीर)
- के०आ०सु० बल इकाई के०एच०ई०पी० कोटेश्वर, टिहरी गढ़वाल (उत्तराखण्ड)
- के०आ०सु० बल 8वीं आरक्षित वाहिनी जयपुर (राजस्थान)
- के०आ०सु० बल इकाई टीएचडीसी टिहरी गढ़वाल (उत्तराखण्ड)

[सं० 12017/1/2012-हिन्दी]

अवधेश कुमार मिश्र, निदेशक (राजभाषा)

### MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS

New Delhi, the 23rd April, 2014

S.O. 1299.—In pursuance of sub rule (4) of rule 10 of the Official Languages (Use for Official Purpose of the Union) Rules, 1976 (as amended, 1987), the Central Government hereby notifies the following 10 offices of the Ministry of Home Affairs, wherein the percentage of the staff having working knowledge of Hindi has gone above 80%:—

1. CISF 7th Res. Bn. Kishtwar (J&K)
2. CISF Unit RHPP Pipri (U.P.)
3. CISF Unit PPCL-III Bawana (New Delhi-39)
4. CISF Unit IG Mint Noida (U.P.)
5. CISF Unit DHEP Dhauli Ganga (Uttarakhand)
6. CISF 9th Res. Bn. Deoli (Rajasthan)
7. CISF Unit SHEP Sewa-II (J&K)
8. CISF Unit KHEP Koteshwar, Tehri Garhwal (Uttarakhand)
9. CISF 8th Res. Bn. Jaipur (Rajasthan)
10. CISF THDC Tehri Garhwal (Uttarakhand)

[No. 12017/1/2012-Hindi]  
AVDESH KUMAR MISHRA, Director (OL)

**कार्मिक, लोक शिकायत तथा पेंशन मंत्रालय**

(कार्मिक और प्रशिक्षण विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 22 अप्रैल, 2014

**का०आ० 1300.**—केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद् द्वारा दण्ड प्रक्रिया संहिता, 1973 (1974 का अधिनियम सं० 2) की धारा 24 की उपथारा (8) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए दिल्ली उच्च न्यायालय, दिल्ली में दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापना (सी०बी०आई०) द्वारा प्रारंभ किए गए सी०बी०आई० केस आरसी 2 (ए)/2005-सी०बी०आई०, एसी०य०-V, नई दिल्ली (उत्तर प्रदेश सरकार के पूर्व मुख्य सचिव श्री अखंड प्रताप सिंह तथा अन्यों के विरुद्ध डीए मामला) तथा उससे जुड़े और प्रासंगिक अन्य मामलों की वजह से उत्पन्न एमए संख्या 3361/2013 तथा आपाराधिक एमए संख्या 12369 और 12370/2013 में पेश होने के लिए भारत के अपर महान्यायधिकर्ता श्री पी०पी० मल्होत्रा को विशेष लोक अभियोजक के रूप में नियुक्त करती है।

[फा० सं० 225/15/2008-ए वी डी०-II ]  
राजीव जैन, अवर सचिव

**MINISTRY OF PERSONNEL, PUBLIC GRIEVANCES  
AND PENSIONS**

**(Department of Personnel and Training)**

New Delhi, the 22nd April, 2014

**S.O. 1300.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section(8) of section 24 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (Act No. 2 of 1974), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri P.P. Malhotra, Additional Solicitor General of India as Special Public Prosecutor for appearing in Criminal M.A. No. 3361/2013 and Crl. M.As No. 12369 and 12370/2013 arising out of CBI case RC 2(A)/2005-CBI, ACU-V,

New

Delhi

(DA case against Shri Akhand Pratap Singh, ex-Chief Secretary, Govt. of UP & Others) instituted by the Delhi Special Police Establishment (C.B.I.) in the Delhi High Court at Delhi and other matters connected therewith and incidental thereto.

[F. No. 225/15/2008-AVD-II]  
RAJIV JAIN, Under Secy.

**वित्त मंत्रालय**

(वित्तीय सेवाएं विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 28 अप्रैल, 2014

**का०आ० 1301.**—पेंशन निधि विनियामक एवं विकास प्राधिकरण अधिनियम, 2013 (2013 का 23) की धारा 4 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा श्री राज विकास वर्मा को पेंशन निधि विनियामक एवं विकास प्राधिकरण (पीएफआरडीए) पूर्णकालिक सदस्य (वित्त) को पद का कार्यभार ग्रहण करने की तारीख से पांच वर्ष की अवधि के लिए या 62 वर्ष की आयु प्राप्त करने तक या अगले आदेशों तक, जो भी पहले हो, आवास और कार की सुविधा के बिना 3.75 लाख रूपये प्रति माह के वेतनमान में नियुक्त करती है।

[फा०सं० 2/1/2012-पीआर]  
सुरिन्द्र कौर, अवर सचिव

**MINISTRY OF FINANCE**

**(Department of Financial Services)**

New Delhi, the 28th April, 2014

**S.O. 1301.**—In exercise of powers conferred by Section 4 of the Pension Fund Regulatory and Development Authority Act, 2013 (23 of 2013), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri Raj Vikash Verma, as Whole-Time Member (Finance) in the Pension Fund Regulatory and Development Authority (PFRDA), for a period of five years w.e.f. the date of assumption of charge of the post or till attaining the age of 62 years or until further orders, whichever is the earliest, at a consolidated pay of Rs. 3.75 lakh (Rs. Three Lakh and seventy five thousand only) per month, without facility of house and car.

[F. No. 2/1/2012-PR]  
SURINDER KAUR, Under Secy.

**वाणिज्य और उद्योग मंत्रालय**

(वाणिज्य विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 25 अप्रैल, 2014

**का.आ० 1302.**—केन्द्रीय सरकार, निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1964 के नियम 12 के उपनियम (2) के साथ

पठित नियांत (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 7 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, मैसर्स एसजीएस इंडिया प्रा० लि० सत्यभामा (जोशी बिल्डिंग), तीसरी मंजिल, रुआ फ्रांसिस्को लूयूस गोम्स, पी०ओ० बोक्स नं० 101, वास्को डी गामा, गोवा भारत में स्थित है, को इस अधिसूचना, के राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की अवधि के लिए भारत सरकार के वाणिज्य मंत्रालय, की अधिसूचना सं० का०आ० 3975 तारीख 20 दिसम्बर, 1965 की अधिसूचना में उपाबद्ध अनुसूचियों में विनिर्दिष्ट खनिज और अयस्क, ग्रुप-I, अर्थात् लौह अयस्क को नियांत से पूर्व निम्नलिखित शर्तों के अधीन गोवा, में उक्त खनिज और अयस्क के निरीक्षण करने के लिए एक अभिकरण के रूप में मान्यता देती है, अर्थात्:-

- (i) मैसर्स एसजीएस इंडिया प्रा० लि० सत्यभामा (जोशी बिल्डिंग), तीसरी मंजिल, रुआ फ्रांसिस्को लूयूस गोम्स, पी० ओ० बोक्स नं० 101, वास्को डी गामा, गोवा, खनिज और अयस्क ग्रुप-I का नियांत (निरीक्षण) नियम, 1965 के नियम 4 के अधीन उनके द्वारा अपनाई गई निरीक्षण की पद्धति की जांच करने के लिए, इस निमित्त नियांत निरीक्षण परिषद् द्वारा नामनिर्दिष्ट अधिकारियों को पर्याप्त सुविधाएं देगी; और
- (ii) मैसर्स एसजीएस इंडिया प्रा० लि० सत्यभामा (जोशी बिल्डिंग), तीसरी मंजिल, रुआ फ्रांसिस्को लूयूस गोम्स, पी० ओ० बोक्स नं० 101, वास्को डी गामा, गोवा, इस अधिसूचना के अधीन अपने कृत्यों के पालन में निदेशक (निरीक्षण और क्वालिटी नियंत्रण) नियांत निरीक्षण परिषद् समय-समय पर लिखित में दिए गए ऐसे निर्देशों से आबद्ध होंगे।

[फा० सं० 4/11/2013-नियांत निरीक्षण]  
ए० के० त्रिपाठी, संयुक्त सचिव

## MINISTRY OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY

### (Department of Commerce)

New Delhi, the 25th April, 2014

**S.O. 1302.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by the sub-section (1) of Section 7 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), read with sub-rule (2) of rule 12 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1964, the Central Government hereby recognises M/s. SGS India Pvt. Ltd., Satyabhama (Joshi Building), 3rd Floor, Rua Francisco Luis Gomes, P.O. Box No. 101, Vasco da Gama, Goa, India, as an agency for a period of three years from the date of publication of this notification in the Official Gazette, for the inspection of Minerals and Ores-Group-I, namely, Iron Ore and Bauxite, specified in the Schedule annexed to the

notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Commerce number S.O. 3975, dated the 20th December 1965, prior to export of said minerals and ores at Goa, subject to the following conditions, namely:—

- (i) that M/s. SGS India Pvt. Ltd., Satyabhama (Joshi Building), 3rd Floor, Rua Francisco Luis Gomes, P.O. Box No. 101, Vasco da Gama, Goa, shall give adequate facilities to the officers nominated by the Export Inspection Council in this behalf to examine the method of inspection followed by them in carrying out the inspection under rule 4 of the Export of Minerals and Ores-Group I (Inspection) Rules, 1965; and
- (ii) that M/s. SGS India Pvt. Ltd., Satyabhama (Joshi Building), 3rd Floor, Rua Francisco Luis Gomes, P.O. Box No. 101, Vasco da Gama, Goa, in the performance of their function under this notification shall be bound by such directions as the Director (Inspection and Quality Control) may give in writing, from time to time.

[F.No. 4/11/2013-Export Inspection]  
A.K. TRIPATHY, Jt. Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 25 अप्रैल, 2014

का.आ. 1303.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, नियांत (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1964 के नियम 12 के उपनियम (2) के साथ पठित नियांत (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 7 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, मैसर्स आर० वी० बिंग्स एंड क० (प्रा०) लि०, डाकघर-बारबिल, जिला क्योंझार, उड़ीसा को इस अधिसूचना, के राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की अवधि के लिए भारत सरकार के वाणिज्य मंत्रालय, की अधिसूचना का० आ० 3975 तारीख 20 दिसम्बर, 1965 की अधिसूचना में उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट खनिज और अयस्क, समूह-I, अर्थात् लौह अयस्क को नियांत से पूर्व निम्नलिखित शर्तों के अधीन बारबिल, में निरीक्षण करने के लिए एक अभिकरण के रूप में मान्यता देती है, अर्थात्:—

- (i) मैसर्स आर० वी० बिंग्स एंड क० (प्रा०) लि०, डाकघर-बारबिल, जिला क्योंझार, उड़ीसा, खनिज और अयस्क समूह-I का नियांत (निरीक्षण) नियम, 1965 के नियम 4 के अधीन उनके द्वारा अपनाई गई निरीक्षण की पद्धति की जांच करने के लिए, इस निमित्त नियांत निरीक्षण परिषद् द्वारा नामनिर्दिष्ट अधिकारियों को पर्याप्त सुविधाएं देगी,

(ii) मैसर्स आर० बी० बिंग्स एंड क० (प्रा०) लि० डाकघर-बारबिल, जिला क्योंझार, उड़ीसा, इस अधिसूचना के अधीन अपने कृत्यों के पालन में निदेशक (निरीक्षण और क्वालिटी नियंत्रण) द्वारा समय-समय पर लिखित में दिए गए ऐसे निर्देशों से आबद्ध होंगे।

[फा० सं० 4/12/2013-निर्यात निरीक्षण]

ए० क० त्रिपाठी, संयुक्त सचिव

New Delhi, the 25th April, 2014

**S.O. 1303.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by the sub-section (1) of Section 7 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), read with sub-rule (2) of rule 12 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1964, the Central Government hereby recognises M/s. R.V. Briggs & Co. (P) Ltd., P.O.-Barbil, District-Keonjhar, Orissa, as an agency for a period of three years from the date of publication of this notification in the Official Gazette, for the inspection of Minerals and Ores-Group-I, namely, Iron Ore and Manganese, Ore, specified in the Schedule annexed to the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Commerce number S.O. 3975, dated the 20th December 1965, prior to export of said minerals and ores at Barbil, subject to the following conditions, namely:—

- (i) that M/s R.V. Briggs & Co. (P) Ltd., P.O.-Barbil, District-Keonjhar, Orissa, shall give adequate facilities to the officers nominated by the Export Inspection Council in this behalf to examine the method of inspection followed by them in carrying out the inspection under rule 4 of the Export of Minerals and Ores-Group I (Inspection) Rules, 1965; and
- (ii) that M/s. R.V. Briggs & Co. (P) Ltd., P.O.-Barbil, District-Keonjhar, Orissa, in the performance of their function under this notification shall be bound by such directions as the Director (Inspection and Quality Control) may give in writing, from time to time.

[F.No. 4/12/2013-Export Inspection]

A.K. TRIPATHY, Jt. Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 25 अप्रैल, 2014

**का.आ. 1304.**—केन्द्रीय सरकार, निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1964 के नियम 12 के उपनियम (2) के साथ पठित निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 7 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, मैसर्स एसजीएस इंडिया प्रा० लि०, प्लाट नं० 64,

जीआईडीसी, मैन रोड, धर्म पुर, पोरबंदर-360577 गुजरात, भारत में स्थित है, को इस अधिसूचना, के राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की अवधि के लिए भारत सरकार के वाणिज्य मंत्रालय, की अधिसूचना सं० का०आ० 3975 तारीख 20 दिसम्बर, 1965 और संख्या का०आ० 3978 दिनांक 20 दिसम्बर 1965 की अधिसूचना में उपाबद्ध अनुसूचियों में विनिर्दिष्ट खनिज और अयस्क, ग्रुप-I, बक्साइट तथा खनिज और अयस्क ग्रुप-II अर्थात् जिंक कन्सेन्ट्रेट को क्रमशः निर्यात से पूर्व निम्नलिखित शर्तों के अधीन पोरबंदर, कच्छ, जामनगर और पीपावाव, में उक्त खनिज और अयस्क के निरीक्षण करने के लिए एक अभिकरण के रूप में मान्यता देती है, अर्थात्:

- (i) मैसर्स एसजीएस इंडिया प्रा० लि० प्लाट नं० 64, जीआईडीसी, मैन रोड, धर्म पुर, पोरबंदर-360577 गुजरात, खनिज और अयस्क ग्रुप-I, का निर्यात (निरीक्षण) नियम, 1965 और खनिज और अयस्क ग्रुप-II का निर्यात (निरीक्षण) नियम, 1965 के नियम 4 के अधीन उनके द्वारा अपनाई गई निरीक्षण की पद्धति की जांच करने के लिए, इस निर्मित निर्यात निरीक्षण परिषद् द्वारा नामनिर्दिष्ट अधिकारियों को पर्याप्त सुविधाएं देगी, और
- (ii) मैसर्स एसजीएस इंडिया प्रा० लि० प्लाट नं० 64, जीआईडीसी, मैन रोड, धर्म पुर, पोरबंदर-360577 गुजरात, इस अधिसूचना के अधीन अपने कृत्यों के पालन में निदेशक (निरीक्षण और क्वालिटी नियंत्रण) निर्यात निरीक्षण परिषद् समय-समय पर लिखित में दिए गए ऐसे निर्देशों से आबद्ध होंगे।

[फा० सं० 4/13/2013-निर्यात निरीक्षण]

ए० क० त्रिपाठी, संयुक्त सचिव

New Delhi, the 25th April, 2014

**S.O. 1304.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by the sub-section (1) of Section 7 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), read with sub-rule (2) of rule 12 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1964, the Central Government hereby recognises M/s. SGS India Pvt. Ltd, Plot No. 64, GIDC Main Road, Dharam Pur, Porbandar-360 577 Gujarat, India, as an agency for a period of three years from the date of publication of this notification in the Official Gazette, for the inspection of Minerals and Ores -Group-I namely, Bauxite and Minerals & Ores Group-II, namely, Zinc Concentrate, specified in the Schedules annexed to the notifications of the Government of India in the Ministry of Commerce number S.O. 3975, dated the 20th December 1965, and number S.O. 3978, dated the 20th December, 1965 respectively, prior to export of the said Minerals and Ores at Porbandar, Kutch, Jamnagar and Pipavav, subject to the following conditions, namely:-

(i) that M/s. SGS India Pvt. Ltd., Plot No. 64, GIDC Main Road, Dharam Pur, Porbandar-360 577, Gujarat, shall give adequate facilities to the officers nominated by the Export Inspection Council in this behalf to examine the method of inspection followed by them in carrying out the inspection under rule 4 of the Export of Minerals and Ores, Group-I (Inspection) Rules, 1965 and the Export of Minerals and Ores-Group-II (Inspection) Rules, 1965; and

(ii) that M/s. SGS India Pvt. Ltd. Plot No. 64, GIDC Main Road, Dharam Pur, Porbandar-360 577 Gujarat, in the performance of their function under this notification shall be bound by such directions the Director (Inspection and Quality Control) Export Inspection Council may give in writing, from time to time.

[F.No. 4/13/2013-Export Inspection]

A.K. TRIPATHY, Jt. Secy.

### पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 29 अप्रैल, 2014

का.आ. 1305.—सक्षम प्राधिकारी, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाईन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 17 के अधीन विरचित पेट्रोलियम और खजिन पाइपलाईन (भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार का अर्जन) नियम, 1963 के नियम 4 के उपनियम (1) के परंतुके अनुसरण में, गेल (इंडिया) लिमिटेड के परामर्श से जिसमें, यथास्थिति, उस क्षेत्र में भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार निहित किया गया है या उस क्षेत्र में पाइपलाईन का स्वामित्व निहित है, नीचे सारणी के स्तंभ 8 में यथा उल्लिखित मध्य प्रदेश राज्य के विजयपुर-दादरी पाइपलाईन परियोजना के माध्यम से पाइपलाईन बिछाये जाने के प्रचालन की समाप्ति की तारीख घोषित करता है।

संलग्नक-1

### अनुसूची

क्रम सं.	गांव का नाम	तालुका/ तहसील	धारा 3 (1) के अधीन अधिसूचना		धारा 6 (1) के अधीन अधिसूचना		कार्य की समाप्ति का दिनांक
			राजपत्र में प्रकाशन का दिनांक	कांग्रेस संख्या और दिनांक	राजपत्र में प्रकाशन का दिनांक	कांग्रेस संख्या और दिनांक	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
1.	बावडीखेड़ी	राधौगढ़	30.03.1985 23.04.2008	311(अ) 30.03.1985 921 (अ) 23.04.2008	14.09.1985 10.10.2008	4293 (अ) 14.09.1985 2435 (अ) 10.10.2008	01.11.2010
2.	दैराना	राधौगढ़	23.04.2008	921 (अ) 23.04.2008	10.10.2008	2435 (अ) 10.10.2008	26.11.2010
3.	पगारा	राधौगढ़	23.04.2008	921 (अ) 23.04.2008	10.10.2008	2435 (अ) 10.10.2008	01.11.2010
4.	रुठियाई	राधौगढ़	23.04.2008	921 (अ) 23.04.2008	10.10.2008	2435 (अ) 10.10.2008	14.05.2010
5.	देहरी	राधौगढ़	23.04.2008	921 (अ) 23.04.2008 30.03.1985	10.10.2008 04.09.1985	2435 (अ) 10.10.2008 4295 (अ) 04.09.1985	01.11.2010
6.	पांज	गुना	23.04.2008	921 (अ) 23.04.2008	10.10.2008	2435 (अ) 10.10.2008	01.11.2010
7.	बजरंगढ	गुना	23.04.2008	921 (अ) 23.04.2008	10.10.2008	2435 (अ) 10.10.2008	26.11.2010
8.	सौजना	गुना	01.12.1984 23.04.2008	4142 (अ) 01.12.1984 921 (अ) 23.04.2008	05.10.1985 10.10.2008	4718(अ) 05.10.1985 2435 (अ) 10.10.2008	01.11.2010
9.	बिनायकखेडी	गुना	08.12.1984 23.04.2008	4282(अ) 08.12.1984 921 (अ) 23.04.2008	06.11.1985 10.10.2008	5231(अ) 06.11.1985 2435 (अ) 10.10.2008	11.11.2010
10.	मुहालपुर	गुना	21.03.1987 23.04.2008	2285(अ) 21.03.1987 921 (अ) 23.04.2008	08.08.1987 10.10.2008	2027(अ) 08.08.1987 2435 (अ) 10.10.2008	26.11.2010

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
11.	छाबनी	गुना	23.04.2008	921 (अ) 23.04.2008	10.10.2008	2435 (अ) 10.10.2008	28.02.2011
12.	सिंगबासा	गुना	01.10.1984	2532(अ) 09.09.1984	17.05.1984	440(अ) 10.05.1985	28.02.2011
			23.04.2008	921 (अ) 23.04.2008	10.10.2008	2435 (अ) 10.10.2008	
13.	पिपरिया	गुना	01.10.1994	2545(अ) 09.04.1994	28.03.1995	270(अ) 24.03.1995	26.11.2010
14.	सिलावटी	गुना	01.10.1994	2533(अ) 09.09.1994	09.03.1995	143(अ) 02.03.1995	11.11.2010
15.	तथवटी	गुना	01.10.1994	2531(अ) 09.09.1994	28.03.1995	269(अ) 24.03.1995	11.11.2010
16.	घमनार	गुना	01.10.1994	2544(अ) 09.09.1994	21.04.1995	377(अ) 19.04.1995	26.11.2010
17.	खुटियाबद	गुना	01.10.1994	2543(अ) 09.09.1994	21.04.1995	375(अ) 19.04.1995	26.11.2010
18.	भद्रेश	गुना	01.10.1994	2541(अ) 09.09.1994	21.04.1995	375(अ) 19.04.1995	20.12.2010
19.	ग्वारखेडा	गुना	01.10.1994	2542(अ) 09.09.1994	09.03.1995	149(अ) 02.03.1995	11.11.2010
20.	सगोरिया	गुना	01.10.1994	2540(अ) 09.09.1994	21.04.1995	376(अ) 19.04.1995	11.11.2010
21.	जमरा	गुना	01.10.1994	2539(अ) 09.09.1994	09.03.1995	148(अ) 02.03.1995	26.11.2010
22.	म्याना	गुना	01.10.1994	2538(अ) 09.09.1994	21.04.1995	374(अ) 19.04.1995	18.12.2010
23.	पदमनखेडी	गुना	01.10.1994	2537(अ) 09.09.1994	09.03.1995	147(अ) 02.03.1995	11.11.2010
24.	खजूरी	गुना	01.10.1994	2536(अ) 09.09.1994	09.03.1995	146(अ) 02.03.1995	11.11.2010
25.	रावसरजागीर	ईसागढ	01.10.1994	2535(अ) 09.09.1994	03.03.1995	145(अ) 02.03.1995	26.11.2010
26.	घुरबारकला	ईसागढ	01.10.1994	2534(अ) 09.09.1994	09.03.1995	144(अ) 02.03.1995	11.11.2010
27.	सींगाखेडी	कोलारस	15.10.1994	2762(अ) 22.09.1994	21.04.1995	367(अ) 19.04.1995	11.11.2010
28.	बकसपुर	कोलारस	15.10.1994	2463(अ) 22.09.1994	21.04.1995	367(अ) 28.04.1995	11.11.2010
29.	सुमेला	कोलारस	15.10.1994	2766(अ) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	262(अ) 24.03.1995	26.11.2010
30.	बद्रबास	कोलारस	15.10.1994	2765(अ) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	261(अ) 24.03.1995	26.11.2010
31.	तिलातिली	कोलारस	15.10.1994	2766(अ) 22.09.1994	09.03.1995	150(अ) 02.03.1995	26.11.2010
32.	एनबारा	कोलारस	15.10.1994	2761(अ) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	264(अ) 24.03.1995	26.11.2010
33.	दीगोद	कोलारस	15.10.1994	2764(अ) 22.09.1994	09.03.1995	151(अ) 02.03.1995	11.11.2010
34.	चितारा	कोलारस	15.10.1994	2768(अ) 22.09.1994	09.03.1995	152(अ) 02.03.1995	28.02.2011
35.	बूढ़ा डोंगर	कोलारस	25.02.1995	509(अ) 11.02.1995	13.06.1995	518(अ) 02.06.1995	28.02.2011
36.	कुल्हाडी	कोलारस	15.10.1994	2769(अ) 22.09.1994	21.04.1995	365(अ) 19.04.1995	29.10.2010
37.	खरई	कोलारस	15.10.1994	2770(अ) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	265(अ) 24.03.1995	29.10.2010
38.	लुकवासा	कोलारस	15.10.1994	2771(अ) 22.09.1994	09.03.1995	153(अ) 02.03.1995	29.10.2010
39.	डॉंडयाई	कोलारस	15.10.1994	2772(अ) 22.09.1994	09.03.1995	154(अ) 02.03.1995	29.10.2010
40.	जूर	कोलारस	15.10.1994	2773(अ) 22.09.1994	09.03.1995	125(अ) 02.03.1995	29.10.2010
41.	उकाबला	कोलारस	15.10.1994	2774(अ) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	263(अ) 24.03.1995	29.10.2010
42.	पनबारी	कोलारस	15.10.1994	2775(अ) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	271(अ) 24.03.1995	28.02.2011
43.	गुड़ा	कोलारस	15.10.1994	2776(अ) 22.09.1994	09.03.1995	156(अ) 02.03.1995	01.11.2010
44.	गुणबारा	कोलारस	15.10.1994	2777(अ) 22.09.1994	09.03.1995	157(अ) 02.03.1995	29.10.2010

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
45.	बीरमखेड़ी	कोलारस	15.10.1994	2778(अ) 22.09.1994	09.03.1995	158(अ) 02.03.1995	01.11.2010
46.	मोहरा	कोलारस	15.10.1994	2779(अ) 22.09.1994	09.03.1995	159(अ) 02.03.1995	01.11.2010
47.	तिघरिया	कोलारस	15.10.1994	2780(अ) 22.09.1994	09.03.1995	160(अ) 02.03.1995	01.11.2010
48.	पिपरोदा	कोलारस	15.10.1994	2781(अ) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	267(अ) 24.03.1995	01.11.2010
49.	बागरोद	कोलारस	15.10.1994	2782(अ) 22.09.1994	09.03.1995	161(अ) 02.03.1995	01.11.2010
50.	नेतवास	कोलारस	15.10.1994	2783(अ) 22.09.1994	09.03.1995	162(अ) 02.03.1995	01.11.2010
51.	कुलबारा	कोलारस	15.10.1994	2766(अ) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	266(अ) 24.03.1995	01.11.2010
52.	मढ़ीखेड़ी	कोलारस	15.10.1994	2784(अ) 22.09.1994	09.03.1995	163(अ) 02.03.1995	01.11.2010
53.	डहरवारा	कोलारस	15.10.1994	2785(अ) 22.09.1994	21.04.1995	366(अ) 19.04.1995	01.11.2010
54.	बिलोकला	शिवपुरी	29.10.1994	2975(अ) 22.09.1994	21.04.1995	369(अ) 19.04.1995	01.11.2010
55.	चौकी	शिवपुरी	29.10.1994	2975(अ) 22.09.1994	02.05.1995	395(अ) 28.04.1995	01.11.2010
56.	असुबाखेड़ी	शिवपुरी	29.10.1994	2975(अ) 22.09.1994	21.04.1995	369(अ) 17.04.1995	01.11.2010
57.	मालाखेड़ी	शिवपुरी	29.10.1994	2975(अ) 22.09.1994	21.04.1995	369(अ) 19.04.1995	01.11.2010
58.	टोंगरा	शिवपुरी	29.10.1994	2975(अ) 22.09.1994	21.04.1995	369(अ) 19.04.1995	25.02.2011
59.	तानपुरा	शिवपुरी	29.10.1994	2975(अ) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	258(अ) 25.03.1995	28.02.2011
60.	कोडाबदा	शिवपुरी	29.10.1994	2975(अ) 22.09.1994	21.04.1995	369(अ) 19.04.1995	25.02.2011
61.	कबीरखेड़ी	शिवपुरी	29.10.1994	2975(अ) 22.09.1994	21.04.1995	369(अ) 19.04.1995	25.02.2011
62.	छार	शिवपुरी	29.10.1994	2975(अ) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	258(अ) 25.03.1995	25.02.2011
63.	र्टी	शिवपुरी	29.10.1994	2975(अ) 22.09.1994	21.04.1995	369(अ) 19.04.1995	25.02.2011
64.	र्टा	शिवपुरी	29.10.1994	2975(अ) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	258(अ) 25.03.1995	25.02.2011
65.	खोरधार	शिवपुरी	29.10.1994	2975(अ) 22.09.1994	21.04.1995	369(अ) 19.04.1995	25.02.2011
66.	खरईभाट	शिवपुरी	29.10.1994	2975(अ) 22.09.1994	21.04.1995	369(अ) 19.04.1995	25.02.2011
67.	झकरेश	शिवपुरी	29.10.1994	2975(अ) 22.09.1994	21.04.1995	369(अ) 19.04.1995	25.02.2011
68.	रामाबसई	शिवपुरी	29.10.1994	2975(अ) 22.09.1994	21.04.1995	369(अ) 19.04.1995	25.02.2011
69.	बिलपुरा	शिवपुरी	29.10.1994	2975(अ) 22.09.1994	21.04.1995	369(अ) 19.04.1995	25.02.2011
70.	चकमानकबसई	शिवपुरी	29.10.1994	2975(अ) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	258(अ) 25.03.1995	25.02.2011
71.	चकघेकलबसई	शिवपुरी	29.10.1994	2975(अ) 22.09.1994	21.04.1995	369(अ) 19.04.1995	25.02.2011
72.	तारका	शिवपुरी	29.10.1994	2975(अ) 22.09.1994	21.04.1995	369(अ) 19.04.1995	25.02.2011
73.	माडनखेड़ी	शिवपुरी	29.10.1994	2975(अ) 22.09.1994	21.04.1995	369(अ) 19.04.1995	25.02.2011
74.	सिकराबदा	शिवपुरी	29.10.1994	2975(अ) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	258(अ) 25.03.1995	25.02.2011
75.	सिकराबदी	शिवपुरी	29.10.1994	2975(अ) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	258(अ) 25.03.1995	25.02.2011
76.	सूँड	शिवपुरी	29.10.1994	2975(अ) 22.09.1994	21.04.1995	269(अ) 19.04.1995	25.02.2011
77.	सिमरिया	शिवपुरी	29.10.1994	2975(अ) 22.09.1994	21.04.1995	369(अ) 19.04.1995	03.01.2012
			10.06.2008	1425(अ) 06.06.2008	10.10.2008	2436(अ) 10.10.2008	
78.	सिलपुरा	शिवपुरी	29.10.1994	2975(अ) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	258(अ) 25.03.1995	03.01.2012
			10.06.2008	1425(अ) 06.06.2008	10.10.2008	2436(अ) 10.10.2008	

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
79.	डैंडरी	शिवपुरी	29.10.1994 10.06.2008	2975(अ) 22.09.1994 1425(अ) 06.06.2008	28.03.1995 10.10.2008	258(अ) 25.03.1995 2436(अ) 10.10.2008	03.01.2012
80.	स्थामपुर	शिवपुरी	29.10.1994 25.06.2008	2975(अ) 22.09.1994 1559(अ) 24.06.2008	10.10.2008	2436(अ) 10.10.2008	03.01.2012
81.	बेरजा	पोहरी	29.10.1994	2976(अ) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	24.03.1995	08.01.2012
82.	गूगरपट्टी	पोहरी	29.10.1994 10.06.2008	2976(अ) 22.09.1994 1425(अ) 06.06.2008	28.03.1995 10.10.2008	268(अ) 24.03.1995 2436(अ) 10.10.2008	08.01.2012
83.	गूगरगांव	पोहरी	29.10.1994 25.06.2008	2976(अ) 22.09.1994 1559(अ) 24.06.2008	28.03.1995 10.10.2008	260(अ) 24.03.1995 2436(अ) 10.10.2008	21.04.2011
84.	बीलबरामाता	पोहरी	29.10.1994 25.06.2008	2976(अ) 22.09.1994 1559(अ) 24.06.2008	28.03.1995 10.10.2008	268(अ) 24.03.1995 2436(अ) 10.10.2008	21.04.2011
85.	बिन्हेराखुर्द	पोहरी	29.10.1994 10.06.2008	2976(अ) 22.09.1994 1425(अ) 06.06.2008	28.03.1995 10.10.2008	260(अ) 24.03.1995 2436(अ) 10.10.2008	21.04.2011
86.	हुसैनपुर	पोहरी	29.10.1994 25.06.2008	2976(अ) 22.09.1994 1559(अ) 24.06.2008	28.03.1995 10.10.2008	260(अ) 24.03.1995 2436(अ) 10.10.2008	08.01.2012
87.	बालापुर	पोहरी	29.10.1994 10.06.2008	2976(अ) 22.09.1994 1425(अ) 06.06.2008	21.04.1995 10.10.2008	368(अ) 19.04.1995 2436(अ) 10.10.2008	08.01.2012
88.	आबादपुर	पोहरी	29.10.1994 10.06.2008	2976(अ) 22.09.1994 1425(अ) 06.06.2008	28.03.1995 10.10.2008	260(अ) 24.03.1995 2436(अ) 10.10.2008	21.04.2011
89.	खटका	पोहरी	29.10.1994 10.06.2008	2976(अ) 22.09.1994 1425(अ) 06.06.2008	28.03.1995 10.10.2008	260(अ) 24.03.1995 2436(अ) 10.10.2008	21.04.2011
90.	अहिल्यापुर	पोहरी	29.10.1994 25.06.2008 29.10.1994	2976(अ) 22.09.1994 1559(अ) 24.06.2008 2976(अ) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995 10.10.2008 28.03.1995	260(अ) 24.03.1995 2436(अ) 10.10.2008 268(अ) 24.03.1995	03.01.2012
91.	पटेबरी	पोहरी	25.05.2009 10.06.2008	1336(अ) 22.05.2009 1425(अ) 06.06.2008	06.09.2010	2178(अ) 03.09.2010	03.01.2012
92.	देवपुरकला	पोहरी	29.10.1994 25.06.2008	2976(अ) 22.09.1994 1559(अ) 24.06.2008	21.04.1995 10.10.2008	369(अ) 19.04.1995 2436(अ) 10.10.2008	08.04.2012
93.	गुरीच्छा	पोहरी	29.10.1994 25.06.2008	2976(अ) 22.09.1994 1559(अ) 24.06.2008	28.03.1995 10.10.2008	260(अ) 24.03.1995 2436(अ) 10.10.2008	08.01.2012
94.	बूड़ता	पोहरी	29.10.1994 01.08.2009 25.06.2008	2976(अ) 22.09.1994 1873(अ) 31.07.2009 1559(अ) 24.06.2008	28.03.1995 06.09.2010 10.10.2008	268(अ) 24.03.1995 2188(अ) 03.09.2010 2436(अ) 10.10.2008	08.01.2012
95.	केमा	पोहरी	29.10.1994 25.06.2008	2976(अ) 22.09.1994 1559(अ) 24.06.2008	28.03.1995 10.10.2008	260(अ) 24.03.1995 2436(अ) 10.10.2008	28.09.2010
96.	सहसराम	विजयपुर	15.10.1994 24.06.2008	2786(अ) 22.09.1994 1560(अ) 24.06.2008	21.04.1995 10.10.2008	372(अ) 19.04.1995 2437(अ) 10.10.2008	28.02.2010

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
97.	फररा	विजयपुर	15.10.1994	2786(अ) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	259(अ) 24.03.1995	28.09.2010
			24.06.2008	1560(अ) 24.06.2008	10.10.2008	2437(अ) 10.10.2008	28.02.2010
98.	बुंदेल	विजयपुर	15.10.1994	2786(अ) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	272(अ) 24.03.1995	28.02.2010
99.	दूधर्हि	विजयपुर	15.10.1994	2786(अ) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	272(अ) 24.03.1995	28.09.2010
100.	खुरजान	विजयपुर	25.05.2009	1336(अ) 22.05.2009	06.09.2010	2178(अ) 03.09.2010	28.09.2010
			15.10.1994	2786(अ) 22.09.1994	21.04.1995	372(अ) 19.04.1995	28.09.2010
101.	टिडावली	जौरा	15.10.1994	2787(अ) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	256(अ) 24.03.1995	28.09.2010
			24.06.2008	1561(अ) 24.06.2008	10.10.2008	2434(अ) 10.10.2008	
102.	भूरी	जौरा	15.10.1994	2787(अ) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	256(अ) 24.03.1995	28.09.2010
			24.06.2008	1561(अ) 24.06.2008	10.10.2008	2434(अ) 10.10.2008	
103.	धोंधा	जौरा	15.10.1994	2787(अ) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	256(अ) 24.03.1995	28.09.2010
			24.06.2008	1561(अ) 24.06.2008	10.10.2008	2434(अ) 10.10.2008	
104.	बसखोहा	जौरा	15.10.1994	2787(अ) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	256(अ) 24.03.1995	28.09.2010
			24.06.2008	1561(अ) 24.06.2008	10.10.2008	2434(अ) 10.10.2008	
105.	जोगीपुरा	जौरा	15.10.1994	2787(अ) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	256(अ) 24.03.1995	28.09.2010
106.	कन्हार	जौरा	15.10.1994	2787(अ) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	256(अ) 24.03.1995	28.09.2010
107.	आरेठी	जौरा	15.10.1994	2787(अ) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	256(अ) 24.03.1995	28.09.2010
108.	रखेरा	जौरा	27.10.1994	2760(अ) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	255(अ) 24.03.1995	28.09.2010
109.	हरियापुरा	जौरा	15.10.1994	2760(अ) 22.09.1994	21.04.1995	370(अ) 19.04.1995	28.09.2010
110.	मरा	जौरा	15.10.1994	2760(अ) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	255(अ) 24.03.1995	28.09.2010
111.	भजेकापुरा	जौरा	15.10.1994	2760(अ) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	255(अ) 24.03.1995	28.09.2010
112.	खडरियापुरा	जौरा	15.10.1994	2760(अ) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	255(अ) 24.03.1995	28.09.2010
113.	गोपालपुरा	जौरा	15.10.1994	2787(अ) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	256(अ) 24.03.1995	28.09.2010
114.	टेलरी	जौरा	15.10.1994	2787(अ) 22.09.1994	15.04.1995	256(अ) 24.03.1995	28.09.2010
115.	धुरकूडा	जौरा	15.10.1994	2787(अ) 22.09.1994	28.09.1995	256(अ) 24.03.1995	28.09.2010
116.	खेरली	जौरा	15.10.1994	2787(अ) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	256(अ) 24.03.1995	28.09.2010
117.	जापथाप	जौरा	15.10.1994	2787(अ) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	256(अ) 24.03.1995	28.09.2010
118.	हुमैनपुर	जौरा	15.10.1994	2787(अ) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	256(अ) 24.03.1995	28.09.2010
119.	बृजगढ़ी	जौरा	15.10.1994	2760(अ) 22.09.1994	21.04.1995	271(अ) 19.04.1995	28.09.2010
120.	सगोरिया	कैलारस	15.10.1994	2788(अ) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	257(अ) 24.03.1995	28.09.2010
121.	सिंगाचोली	कैलारस	15.10.1994	2788(अ) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	257(अ) 24.03.1995	28.09.2010
122.	देवकच्छ	कैलारस	15.10.1994	2788(अ) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	257(अ) 24.03.1995	28.09.2010
123.	बिलौआ	कैलारस	15.10.1994	2788(अ) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	257(अ) 24.03.1995	28.09.2010
124.	भुरावली	कैलारस	15.10.1994	2788(अ) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	257(अ) 24.03.1995	28.09.2010
125.	सुजर्मा	कैलारस	15.10.1994	2788(अ) 22.09.1994	11.05.1996	1408(अ) 15.04.1996	28.09.2010
126.	भिलसैया	कैलारस	15.10.1994	2788(अ) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	257(अ) 24.03.1995	28.09.2010
127.	बेरईमानगढ़	कैलारस	15.10.1994	2788(अ) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	257(अ) 24.03.1995	28.09.2010

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
128.	रिठेनियां	कैलारस	15.10.1994	2788(अ) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	257(अ) 24.03.1995	28.09.2010
129.	नेपरी	कैलारस	15.10.1994	2788(अ) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	257(अ) 24.03.1995	28.09.2010
130.	रजपुराजागोर	कैलारस	15.10.1994	2788(अ) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	273(अ) 24.03.1995	28.09.2010
131.	पचेखा	कैलारस	15.10.1994	2788(अ) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	257(अ) 24.03.1995	28.09.2010
132.	हटीपुरा	कैलारस	15.10.1994	2788(अ) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	257(अ) 24.03.1995	28.09.2010

[फा० सं० एल-14014/24/2014-जी पी।  
एस० पी० अग्रवाल, अवर सचिव

### MINISTRY OF PETROLEUM AND NATURAL GAS

New Delhi, the 29th April, 2014

**S.O. 1305.**—In pursuance of the proviso to sub-rule (i) of rule 4 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Rules, 1963, framed under Section 17 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Competent Authority, GAIL (India) Limited with whom the right of user in the land in that area has been vested or ownership of the pipeline in that area vests as the case may be, hereby declares the date of termination of operation of laying Vijaipur—Dadri Pipeline Project in Madhya Pradesh State as mentioned in column - 8 of the Schedule below, namely:—

#### ANNEXURE-1 SCHEDULE

Sr. No.	Name of Village	Tehsil	Notification Under Section 3(1)		Notification Under Section 6(1)		Date of Termination of operations
			Date of Publication of Gazette	S.O. No. & Date	Date of Publication of Gazette	S.O. No. & Date	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
1	Babdikheda	Raghogarh	30.03.1985 23.04.2008	311(A) 30.03.1985 921 (A) 23.04.2008	14.09.1985 10.10.2008	4293(A) 14.09.1985 2435 (A) 10.10.2008	1.11.2010
2	Dorana	Raghogarh	23.04.2008	921 (A) 23.04.2008	10.10.2008	2435 (A) 10.10.2008	26.11.2010
3	Pagara	Raghogarh	23.04.2008	921 (A) 23.04.2008	10.10.2008	2435 (A) 10.10.2008	1.11.2010
4	Ruthyai	Raghogarh	23.04.2008	921(A)23.04.2008 23.04.2008	10.10.2008 10.10.2008	2435(A)10.10.2008 2435 (A) 10.10.2008	14.05.2010 1.11.2010
5	Dehri	Raghogarh	30.03.1985	1300(A) 30.03.1985	04.09.1985	4295(A) 04.09.1985	
6	Panj	Guna	23.04.2008	921 (A) 23.04.2008	10.10.2008	2435 (A) 10.10.2008	1.11.2010
7	Bagrangghar	Guna	23.04.2008	921(A)23.04.2008 01.12.1984	10.10.2008 50.10.1985	2435(A)10.10.2008 4718(A) 05.10.1985	26.11.2010
8	Sojna	Guna	23.04.2008	921(A)23.04.2008 08.12.1984	10.10.2008 06.11.1985	2435(A)10.10.2008 5231(A)06.11.1985	1.11.2010
9	Vinayakkhedi	Guna	23.04.2008	921(A)23.04.2008 21.03.1987	10.10.2008 08.08.1987	2435(A)10.10.2008 2027(A)08.08.1987	1.11.2010 26.11.2010
10	Muhalpur	Guna	23.04.2008	921 (A) 23.04.2008	10.10.2008	2435 (A) 10.10.2008	26.11.2010
11	Chavni	Guna	23.04.2008	921(A)23.04.2008 01.10.1994	10.10.2008 17.05.1985	2435(A)10.10.2008 440(A)10.05.1985	28.02.2011
12	Sigwasha	Guna	23.04.2008	921(A)23.04.2008	10.10.2008	2435(A)10.10.2008	26.11.2010
13	Pipariya	Guna	01.10.1994	2545(A)09.04.1994	28.03.1995	270(A)24.03.1995	26.11.2010
14	Silawati	Guna	01.10.1994	2533(A)09.09.1994	09.03.1995	143(A)02.03.1995	11.11.2010
15	Tarabta	Guna	01.10.1994	2531(A)09.09.1994	28.03.1995	269(A)24.03.1995	11.11.2010

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
16	Dhamnar	Guna	01.10.1994	2544 (A) 09.09.1994	21.04.1995	377 (A) 19.04.1995	26.11.2010
17	Kutiyabad	Guna	01.10.1994	2543 (A) 09.09.1994	21.04.1995	375 (A) 19.04.1995	26.11.2010
18	Bhadora	Guna	01.10.1994	2543 (A) 09.09.1994	21.04.1995	375 (A) 19.04.1995	20.12.2010
19	Gwarkheda	Guna	01.10.1994	2542 (A) 09.09.1994	09.03.1995	149 (A) 02.03.1995	11.11.2010
20	Sagoriya	Guna	01.10.1994	2540 (A) 09.09.1994	21.04.1995	376 (A) 19.04.1995	11.11.2010
21	Jamra	Guna	01.10.1994	2539 (A) 09.09.1994	09.03.1995	148 (A) 02.03.1995	26.11.2010
22	Myana	Guna	01.10.1994	2538 (A) 09.09.1994	21.04.1995	374 (A) 19.04.1995	18.12.2010
23	Padmankhedi	Guna	01.10.1994	2537 (A) 09.09.1994	09.03.1995	147 (A) 02.03.1995	11.11.2010
24	Khajuri	Guna	01.10.1994	2536 (A) 09.09.1994	09.03.1995	146 (A) 19.04.1995	11.11.2010
25	Rabsarjagir	Ishaghgar	01.10.1994	2535 (A) 09.09.1994	03.03.1995	145 (A) 02.03.1995	26.11.2010
26	Ghurwarkala	Ishaghgar	01.10.1994	2534 (A) 09.09.1994	09.03.1995	144 (A) 02.03.1995	11.11.2010
27	Sigakhedi	Kolaras	15.10.1994	2762 (A) 22.09.1994	21.04.1985	367 (A) 19.04.1995	11.11.2010
28	Bakaspur	Kolaras	15.10.1994	2463 (A) 22.09.1994	02.05.1995	394 (A) 28.04.1995	11.11.2010
29	Sumela	Kolaras	15.10.1994	2766 (A) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	262 (A) 24.03.1995	26.11.2010
30	Badarvash	Kolaras	15.10.1994	2765 (A) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	261 (A) 24.03.1995	26.11.2010
31	Tilatili	Kolaras	15.10.1994	2765 (A) 22.09.1994	09.03.1995	150 (A) 02.03.1995	26.11.2010
32	Anwara	Kolaras	15.10.1994	2761 (A) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	264 (A) 24.03.1995	26.11.2010
33	Digodh	Kolaras	15.10.1994	2764 (A) 22.09.1994	09.03.1995	151 (A) 02.03.1995	11.11.2010
34	Chitara	Kolaras	15.10.1994	2768 (A) 22.09.1994	09.03.1995	152 (A) 02.03.1995	28.02.2011
35	Buda dogar	Kolaras	25.02.1995	509 (A) 11.02.1995	13.06.1995	518 (A) 02.06.1995	28.02.2011
36	Kulhadi	Kolaras	15.10.1994	2769 (A) 22.09.1994	21.04.1995	365 (A) 19.04.1995	29.10.2010
37	Kharai	Kolaras	15.10.1994	2770 (A) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	265 (A) 24.03.1995	29.10.2010
38	Lukwasha	Kolaras	15.10.1994	2771 (A) 22.09.1994	09.03.1995	153 (A) 02.03.1995	29.10.2010
39	Dondyai	Kolaras	15.10.1994	2772 (A) 22.09.1994	09.03.1995	154 (A) 02.03.1995	29.10.2010
40	Jur	Kolaras	15.10.1994	2773 (A) 22.09.1994	09.03.1995	125 (A) 02.03.1995	29.10.2010
41	Ukawal	Kolaras	15.10.1994	2774 (A) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	263 (A) 24.03.1995	29.10.2010
42	Panwari	Kolaras	15.10.1994	2775 (A) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	271 (A) 24.03.1995	01.11.2011
43	Gudha	Kolaras	15.10.1994	2776 (A) 22.09.1994	09.03.1995	156 (A) 02.03.1995	29.10.2010
44	Gugwara	Kolaras	15.10.1994	2777 (A) 22.09.1994	09.03.1995	157 (A) 02.03.1995	29.10.2010
45	Biramkhedi	Kolaras	15.10.1994	2778 (A) 22.09.1994	09.03.1995	158 (A) 02.03.1995	01.11.2010
46	Mohra	Kolaras	15.10.1994	2779 (A) 22.09.1994	09.03.1995	159 (A) 02.03.1995	01.11.2010
47	Tighariya	Kolaras	15.10.1994	2780 (A) 22.09.1994	09.03.1995	160 (A) 02.03.1995	01.11.2010
48	Piprodhya	Kolaras	15.10.1994	2781 (A) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	267 (A) 24.03.1995	01.11.2010
49	Bagroda	Kolaras	15.10.1994	2782 (A) 22.09.1994	09.03.1995	161 (A) 02.03.1995	01.11.2010
50	Nitwash	Kolaras	15.10.1994	2783 (A) 22.09.1994	09.03.1995	162 (A) 02.03.1995	01.11.2010
51	Kulwara	Kolaras	15.10.1994	2766 (A) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	266 (A) 24.03.1995	01.11.2010
52	Madikhera	Kolaras	15.10.1994	2784 (A) 22.09.1994	09.03.1995	163 (A) 02.03.1995	01.11.2010
53	Deherwara	Kolaras	15.10.1994	2785 (A) 22.09.1994	21.04.1995	366 (A) 19.04.1995	01.11.2010
54	Bilokala	Shivpuri	29.10.1994	2975 (A) 22.09.1994	21.04.1995	369 (A) 19.04.1995	01.11.2010
55	Choki	Shivpuri	29.10.1994	2975 (A) 22.09.1994	02.05.1995	395 (A) 28.04.1995	01.11.2010
56	Asuakehdi	Shivpuri	29.10.1994	2975 (A) 22.09.1994	21.04.1995	369 (A) 17.04.1995	01.11.2010
57	Malakhedi	Shivpuri	29.10.1994	2975 (A) 22.09.1994	21.04.1995	369 (A) 19.04.1995	01.11.2010
58	Tongra	Shivpuri	29.10.1994	2975 (A) 22.09.1994	21.04.1995	369 (A) 19.04.1995	25.02.2011
59	Tanpur	Shivpuri	29.10.1994	2975 (A) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	258 (A) 25.03.1995	28.02.2011
60	Kodabda	Shivpuri	29.10.1994	2975 (A) 22.09.1994	21.04.1995	369 (A) 19.04.1995	25.02.2011
61	Kabirkhedi	Shivpuri	29.10.1994	2975 (A) 22.09.1994	21.04.1995	369 (A) 19.04.1995	25.02.2011
62	Chhar	Shivpuri	29.10.1994	2975 (A) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	258 (A) 25.03.1995	25.02.2011

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
63	Tharri	Shivpuri	29.10.1994	2975 (A) 22.09.1994	21.04.1995	369 (A) 19.04.1995	25.02.2011
64	Thara	Shivpuri	29.10.1994	2975 (A) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	258 (A) 25.03.1995	25.02.2011
65	Khorghar	Shivpuri	29.10.1994	2975 (A) 22.09.1994	21.04.1995	369 (A) 19.04.1995	25.02.2011
66	Kharaibhat	Shivpuri	29.10.1994	2975 (A) 22.09.1994	21.04.1995	369 (A) 19.04.1995	25.02.2011
67	Dakrora	Shivpuri	29.10.1994	2975 (A) 22.09.1994	21.04.1995	369 (A) 19.04.1995	25.02.2011
68	Ramabasai	Shivpuri	29.10.1994	2975 (A) 22.09.1994	21.04.1995	369 (A) 19.04.1995	25.02.2011
69	Bilupura	Shivpuri	29.10.1994	2975 (A) 22.09.1994	21.04.1995	369 (A) 19.04.1995	25.02.2011
70	Chakmankbasai	Shivpuri	29.10.1994	2975 (A) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	258 (A) 25.03.1995	25.02.2011
71	Chakdhukalbasai	Shivpuri	29.10.1994	2975 (A) 22.09.1994	21.04.1995	369 (A) 19.04.1995	25.02.2011
72	Tarkaa	Shivpuri	29.10.1994	2975 (A) 22.09.1994	21.04.1995	369 (A) 19.04.1995	25.02.2011
73	Madankhedi	Shivpuri	29.10.1994	2975 (A) 22.09.1994	21.04.1995	369 (A) 19.04.1995	25.02.2011
74	Sikrawada	Shivpuri	29.10.1994	2975 (A) 22.09.1994	21.04.1995	258 (A) 25.03.1995	25.02.2011
75	Sikravadi	Shivpuri	29.10.1994	2975 (A) 22.09.1994	21.04.1995	258 (A) 25.03.1995	25.02.2011
76	Sood	Shivpuri	29.10.1994	2975 (A) 22.09.1994	21.04.1995	269 (A) 19.04.1995	25.02.2011
77	Simariya	Shivpuri	29.10.1994	2975 (A) 22.09.1994	21.04.1995	369 (A) 19.04.1995	03.01.2012
			10.06.2008	1425 (A) 06.06.2008	10.10.2008	2436 (A) 10.10.2008	
78	Silpura	Shivpuri	29.10.1994	2975 (A) 22.09.1995	28.03.1995	258 (A) 25.03.1995	03.01.2012
			10.06.2008	1425 (A) 06.06.2008	10.10.2008	2436 (A) 10.10.2008	
79	Dendri	Shivpuri	29.10.1994	2975 (A) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	258 (A) 25.03.1995	03.01.2012
			10.06.2008	1425 (A) 06.06.2008	10.10.2008	2436(A) 10.10.2008	
80	Shyampur	Shivpuri	29.10.1994	2975(A)22.09.1994	10.10.2008	2436(A)10.10.2008	03.01.2012
			25.06.2008	1559(A)24.06.2008	10.10.2008	2436(A)10.10.2008	
81	Berja	Pohri	29.10.1994	2976(A)22.09.1994	28.03.1995	24.03.1995	08.01.2012
82	Gugarpati	Pohri	29.10.1994	2976(A)22.09.1994	28.03.1995	268(A)24.03.1995	
			10.06.2008	1425(A)06.06.2008	10.10.2008		
83	Gugargaov	Pohri	29.10.1994	2976(A)22.09.1994	28.03.1995	260(A)24.03.199	21.04.2011
			25.06.2008	1559(A)24.06.2008	10.10.2008	2436(A)10.10.2008	
84	Billibaramata	Pohri	29.10.1994	2976(A)22.09.1994	28.03.1995	268(A)24.03.1995	21.04.2011
			25.06.2008	1559(A)24.06.2008	10.10.2008	2436(A)10.10.2008	
85	Vinherakhurd	Pohri	29.10.1994	2976(A)22.09.1994	28.03.1995	260(A)24.03.1995	21.04.2011
			10.06.2008	1425(A)06.06.2008	2436(A)10.10.2008		
86	Husainpur	Pohri	29.10.1994	2976(A)22.09.1994	28.03.1995	260(A)24.03.1995	08.01.2012
			25.06.2008	1559(A)24.06.2008	10.10.2008	2436(A)10.10.2008	
87	Balapur	Pohri	29.10.1994	2976(A)22.09.1994	21.04.1995	368(A)19.04.1995	08.01.2012
			10.06.2008	1425(A)06.06.2008	10.10.2008	2436(A)10.10.2008	
88	Aavadpur	Pohri	29.10.1994	2976(A)22.09.1994	28.03.1995	260(A)24.03.1995	21.04.2011
			10.06.2008	1425(A)06.06.2008	10.10.2008	2436(A)10.10.2008	
89	Khatka	Pohri	29.10.1994	2976(A)22.09.1994	28.03.1995	260(A)24.03.1995	21.04.2011
			10.06.2008	1425(A)06.06.2008	10.10.2008	2436(A)10.10.2008	
90	Ahilyapur	Pohri	29.10.1994	2976(A)22.09.1994	28.03.1995	260(A)24.03.1995	03.01.2012
			25.06.2008	1559(A)24.06.2008	10.10.2008	2436(A)10.10.2008	
91	Patiwari	Pohri	29.10.1994	2976(A)22.09.1994	28.03.1995	268(A)24.03.1995	03.01.2012
			25.05.2009	1336(A)22.05.2009	06.09.2010	2178(A)03.09.2010	
			10.06.2008	1425(A)06.06.2008	10.10.2008	2436(A)10.10.2008	03.01.2012
92	Devpurkala	Pohri	29.10.1994	2976(A)22.09.1994	21.04.1995	369(A)19.04.1995	08.01.2012
			25.06.2008	1559(A)24.06.2008	10.10.2008	2436(A)10.10.2008	
93	Gurichha	Pohri	29.10.1994	2976(A)22.09.994	28.03.1995	260(A)24.03.1995	08.01.2012
			25.06.2008	1559(A)24.06.2008	10.10.2008	2436(A)10.10.2008	
94	Burda	Pohri	29.10.1994	2976(A)22/09/1994	28.03.1995	268(A)14.03.1995	08.01.2012
			25.06.2009	1559(A)24.06.2008	10.10.2008	2436(A)10.10.2008	
95	Kema	Pohri	29.10.1994	2976(A)22.09.1994	28.03.1995	260(A)24.03.1995	28.09.2010

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
			25.06.2008	1559(A) 24.06.2008	10.10.2008	2436(A) 10.10.2008	28.09.2010
96	Shasram	Vijaipur	15.10.1994	2786(A) 22.09.1994	21.04.1995	372(A) 19.04.1995	28.02.2010
			24.06.2008	1560(A) 24.06.2008	10.10.2008	2437(A) 10.10.2008	
97	Farara	Vijaipur	15.10.1994	2786(A) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	259(A) 24.03.1995	28.09.2010
			24.06.2008	1560(A) 24.06.2008	10.10.2008	2437(A) 10.10.2008	28.02.2010
98	Budera	Vijaipur	15.10.1994	2786(A) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	272(A) 24.03.1995	28.02.2010
99	Dudhye	Vijaipur	15.10.1994	2786(A) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	272(A) 24.03.1995	28.09.2010
100	Khurjan	Vijaipur	25.05.2009	1336(A) 22.05.2009	06.09.2010	2178(A) 03.09.2010	28.09.2010
			15.10.1994	2786(A) 22.09.1994	21.04.1995	372(A) 19.04.1995	28.09.2010
101	Tidabli	Jora	15.10.1994	2787(A) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	256(A) 24.03.1995	28.09.2010
			24.06.2008	1561(A) 24.06.2008	10.10.2008	2434(A) 10.10.2008	
102	Bhuri	Jora	15.10.1994	2787(A) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	256(A) 24.03.1995	28.09.2010
			24.06.2008	1561(A) 24.06.2008	10.10.2008	2434(A) 10.10.2008	
103	Dhondha	Jora	15.10.1994	2787(A) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	245(A) 24.03.1995	28.09.2010
			24.06.2008	1561(A) 24.06.2008	10.10.2008	2434(A) 10.10.2008	
104	Baskhoa	Jora	15.10.1994	2787(A) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	256(A) 24.03.1995	28.09.2010
			24.06.2008	1561(A) 24.06.2008	10.10.2008	2434(A) 10.10.2008	
105	Jogipura	Jora	15.10.1994	2787(A) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	256(A) 24.03.1995	28.09.2010
106	Kanhar	Jora	15.10.1994	2787(A) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	256(A) 24.03.1995	28.09.2010
107	Arithi	Jora	15.10.1994	2787(A) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	256(A) 24.03.1995	28.09.2010
108	Rakhera	Jora	27.10.1994	2760(A) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	255(A) 24.03.1995	28.09.2010
109	Hariyapura	Jora	15.10.1994	2760(A) 22.09.1994	21.04.1995	370(A) 19.04.1995	28.09.2010
110	Mara	Jora	15.10.1994	2760(A) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	255(A) 24.03.1995	28.09.2010
111	Bhajekapura	Jora	15.10.1994	2760(A) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	255(A) 24.03.1995	28.09.2010
112	Khadiyapura	Jora	15.10.1994	2760(A) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	255(A) 24.03.1995	28.09.2010
113	Gopalpura	Jora	15.10.1994	2787(A) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	256(A) 24.03.1995	28.09.2010
114	Telri	Jora	15.10.1994	2787(A) 22.09.1994	15.04.1995	256(A) 24.03.1995	28.09.2010
115	Ghurkuda	Jora	15.10.1994	2787(A) 22.09.1994	28.09.1995	256(A) 24.03.1995	28.09.2010
116	Kherli	Jora	15.10.1994	2787(A) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	256(A) 24.03.1995	28.09.2010
117	Japthap	Jora	15.10.1994	2787(A) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	256(A) 24.03.1995	28.09.2010
118	Husenpur	Jora	15.10.1994	2787(A) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	256(A) 24.03.1995	28.09.2010
119	Brajghadi	Jora	15.10.1994	2760(A) 22.09.1994	21.04.1995	271(A) 19.04.1995	28.09.2010
120	Sagoriya	Kelaras	15.10.1994	2788(A) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	257(A) 24.03.1995	28.09.2010
121	Sighacholi	Kelaras	15.10.1994	2788(A) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	257(A) 24.03.1995	28.09.2010
122	Devchha	Kelaras	15.10.1994	2788(A) 22.03.1994	28.03.1995	257(A) 24.03.1995	28.09.2010
123	Bilaooa	Kelaras	15.10.1994	2788(A) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	257(A) 24.03.1995	28.09.2010
124	Burabli	Kelaras	15.10.1994	2788(A) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	257(A) 24.03.1995	28.09.2010
125	Sujarma	Kelaras	15.10.1994	2788(A) 22.09.1994	11.05.1996	1408(A) 15.04.1996	28.09.2010
126	Bilsaiya	Kelaras	15.10.1994	2788(A) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	257(A) 24.03.1995	28.09.2010
127	Beraimanghar	Kelaras	15.10.1994	2788(A) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	257(A) 24.03.1995	28.09.2010
128	Rithoniya	Kelaras	15.10.1994	2788(A) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	257(A) 24.03.1995	28.09.2010
129	Nepri	Kelaras	15.10.1994	2788(A) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	257(A) 24.03.1995	28.09.2010
130	Rajpurajagir	Kelaras	15.10.1994	2788(A) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	273(A) 24.03.1995	28.09.2010
131	Pachikha	Kelaras	15.10.1994	2788(A) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	257(A) 24.03.1996	28.09.2010
132	Hatipura	Kelaras	15.10.1994	2788(A) 22.09.1994	28.03.1995	257(A) 24.03.1995	28.09.2010

नई दिल्ली, 29 अप्रैल, 2014

**का.आ. 1306.**--सक्षम प्राधिकारी, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाईन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 17 के अधीन विरचित पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाईन (भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार का अर्जन) नियम, 1963 के नियम 4 के उपनियम (1) के परंतुके अनुसरण में, गेल (इण्डिया) लिमिटेड के परामर्श से जिसमें, यथास्थिति, उस क्षेत्र में भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार निहित किया गया है या उस क्षेत्र में पाइपलाईन का स्वामित्व निहित है, नीचे सारणी के स्तम्भ 8 में यथा उल्लिखित मध्य प्रदेश राज्य के दहेज-वेमार-विजयपुर पाइपलाईन परियोजना के माध्यम से पाइपलाईन बिछाये जाने के प्रचालन की समाप्ति की तारीख घोषित करता है।

संलग्नक-1

### अनुसूची

क्रम सं.	गांव का नाम	तालुका तहसील	धारा 3 (1) के अधीन अधिसूचना		धारा 6 (1) के अधीन अधिसूचना		कार्य की समाप्ति का दिनांक
			राजपत्र में प्रकाशन का दिनांक	का.आ. संख्या और दिनांक	राजपत्र में प्रकाशन का दिनांक	का.आ. संख्या और दिनांक	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
1.	संडावता	सारंगपुर	11.06.2009	1449(अ) 10.06.2009	10.11.2009	2858(अ) 10.11.2009	25.08.2011
2.	खंजरपुर	सारंगपुर	11.06.2009	1449(अ) 10.06.2009	10.11.2009	2858(अ) 10.11.2009	12.09.2011
3.	बरखेडीखुर्म	सारंगपुर	11.06.2009	1449(अ) 10.06.2009	10.11.2009	2858(अ) 10.11.2009	15.09.2011
4.	चाटाखेडी	सारंगपुर	11.06.2009	1449(अ) 10.06.2009	10.11.2009	2858(अ) 10.11.2009	15.09.2011
5.	रसूलपुरा	राजगढ़	11.06.2009	1449(अ) 10.06.2009	10.11.2009	2858(अ) 10.11.2009	28.12.2011
6.	कलपोनी	राजगढ़	11.06.2009	1449(अ) 10.06.2009	10.11.2009	2858(अ) 10.11.2009	21.09.2011
7.	पाडलियाखेडी	राजगढ़	11.06.2009	1449(अ) 10.06.2009	10.11.2009	2858(अ) 10.11.2009	21.09.2011
8.	चौसला	राजगढ़	11.06.2009	1449(अ) 10.06.2009	10.11.2009	2858(अ) 10.11.2009	21.04.2012
9.	तुमिडियाखेडी	राजगढ़	11.06.2009	1449(अ) 10.06.2009	10.11.2009	2858(अ) 10.11.2009	20.06.2012
10.	गुराडिया	राजगढ़	11.06.2009	1449(अ) 10.06.2009	10.11.2009	2558(अ) 10.11.2009	20.06.2012
11.	खजूरी	राजगढ़	11.06.2009	1449(अ) 10.06.2009	10.11.2009	2558(अ) 10.11.2009	20.06.2012
12.	गोरखपुरा	राजगढ़	22.06.2009	1804(अ) 22.06.2009	10.11.2009	2858(अ) 10.11.2009	08.04.2011
13.	किशनपुरिया-1	राजगढ़	11.06.2009	1449(अ) 10.06.2009	10.11.2009	2558(अ) 10.11.2009	20.06.2012
14.	कुन्डीवे-1	राजगढ़	08.01.2010	37(अ) 08.01.2010	03.04.2010	746(अ) 03.04.2010	19.09.2011
15.	लालपुरा	राजगढ़	11.06.2009	1449(अ) 10.06.2009	10.11.2009	2858(अ) 10.11.2009	21.04.2012
16.	मोहकमपुरा	राजगढ़	22.09.2009	2421(अ) 22.09.2009	19.01.2010	113(अ) 19.01.2010	13.12.2011
17.	रामीपुरा	राजगढ़	11.06.2009	1449(अ) 10.06.2009	10.11.2009	2858(अ) 10.11.2009	19.09.2011
18.	दलेलपुरा	राजगढ़	11.06.2009	1449(अ) 10.06.2009	10.11.2009	2858(अ) 10.11.2009	15.09.2011
19.	चेनपुरिया	राजगढ़	11.06.2009	1449(अ) 10.06.2009	10.11.2009	2858(अ) 10.11.2009	13.09.2011
20.	सालपुरा	राजगढ़	22.09.2009	2421(अ) 22.09.2009	10.11.2009	2858(अ) 10.11.2009	26.11.2011
21.	सांगी	राजगढ़	11.06.2009	1449(अ) 10.06.2009	10.11.2009	2858(अ) 10.11.2009	22.04.2012
22.	सावनखेडा	राजगढ़	11.06.2009	1449(अ) 10.06.2009	10.11.2009	2858(अ) 10.11.2009	22.04.2012
23.	जैतपुरा	राजगढ़	11.06.2009	1449(अ) 10.06.2009	10.11.2009	2858(अ) 10.11.2009	21.04.2012
24.	भादवाखेडा	राजगढ़	11.06.2009	1449(अ) 10.06.2009	10.11.2009	2858(अ) 10.11.2009	20.09.2011

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
25.	किशनपुरिया 2	राजगढ़	11.06.2009	1449(अ) 10.06.2009	10.11.2009	2858(अ) 10.11.2009	21.04.2011
26.	रामपुरिया	राजगढ़	11.06.2009	1449(अ) 10.06.2009	10.11.2009	2858(अ) 10.11.2009	21.04.2011
27.	राजलीवे	राजगढ़	11.06.2009	1449(अ) 10.06.2009	10.11.2009	2858(अ) 10.11.2009	20.09.2011
28.	पीपलवे	राजगढ़	11.06.2009	1449(अ) 10.06.2009	10.11.2009	2858(अ) 10.11.2009	19.04.2012
29.	हिरनखेड़ी	राजगढ़	22.07.2009	1804(अ) 22.07.2009	10.11.2009	2858(अ) 10.11.2009	28.12.2011
30.	घोषडियाकला	राजगढ़	11.06.2009	1449(अ) 10.06.2009	10.11.2009	2858(अ) 10.11.2009	09.11.2011
31.	घोषडियाखुर्द	राजगढ़	11.06.2009	1449(अ) 10.06.2009	10.11.2009	2858(अ) 10.11.2009	09.11.2011
32.	गोल्लावे	राजगढ़	22.07.2009	1804(अ) 22.07.2009	10.11.2009	2858(अ) 10.11.2009	24.01.2012
33.	कालीपीठ	राजगढ़	11.06.2009	1449(अ) 10.06.2009	10.11.2009	2858(अ) 10.11.2009	21.04.2012
34.	बनानिया	राजगढ़	11.06.2009	1449(अ) 10.06.2009	10.11.2009	2858(अ) 10.11.2009	20.09.2011
35.	लालयातलाई	राजगढ़	11.06.2009	1449 (अ) 10.06.2009	10.11.2009	2858 (अ) 10.11.2009	19.04.2012
36.	बाजपुरा	राजगढ़	11.06.2009	1449 (अ) 10.06.2009	10.11.2009	2858 (अ) 10.11.2009	19.04.2012
37.	कुन्डीवे 2	राजगढ़	11.06.2009	1449 (अ) 10.06.2009	10.11.2009	2858 (अ) 10.11.2009	24.01.2012
38.	महुवावे	राजगढ़	11.06.2009	1449 (अ) 10.06.2009	10.11.2009	2858 (अ) 10.11.2009	24.01.2012
39.	जोड़किया	राजगढ़	11.06.2009	1449 (अ) 10.06.2009	10.11.2009	2858 (अ) 10.11.2009	19.04.2012
40.	सुवाहेड़ी	राजगढ़	11.06.2009	1449 (अ) 10.06.2009	10.11.2009	2858 (अ) 10.11.2009	19.04.2012
41.	जलालपुरा	राजगढ़	11.06.2009	1449 (अ) 10.06.2009	10.11.2009	2858 (अ) 10.11.2009	21.04.2012
42.	सोनाहेड़ा	चाचौड़ा	22.07.2009	1803 (अ) 22.07.2009	03.12.2009	3095 (अ) 03.12.2009	24.04.2012
43.	सिंगापुरा	चाचौड़ा	22.06.2009	1803 (अ) 22.06.2009	03.12.2009	3095 (अ) 03.12.2009	13.09.2011
44.	नेशखुर्द	चाचौड़ा	22.07.2009	1803 (अ) 22.07.2009	03.12.2009	3095 (अ) 03.12.2009	25.08.2011
45.	नेत्याखेड़ी	चाचौड़ा	22.07.2009	1803 (अ) 22.07.2009	03.12.2009	3095 (अ) 03.12.2009	26.11.2011
46.	झोरदा	चाचौड़ा	03.04.2010	743 (अ) 03.04.2010	03.12.2009	3095 (अ) 03.12.2009	03.04.2011
47.	मोहम्मदपुर	चाचौड़ा	22.07.2009	1803 (अ) 22.07.2009	03.12.2009	3095 (अ) 03.12.2009	19.03.2012
48.	गुन्जारी	चाचौड़ा	22.07.2009	1803 (अ) 22.07.2009	03.12.2009	3095 (अ) 03.12.2009	18.03.2012
49.	मुहासाकला	चाचौड़ा	22.07.2009	1803 (अ) 22.07.2009	03.12.2009	3095 (अ) 03.12.2009	19.03.2012
50.	पोलास	चाचौड़ा	22.07.2009	1803 (अ) 22.07.2009	03.12.2009	3095 (अ) 03.12.2009	18.03.2012
51.	चाचौड़ा	चाचौड़ा	22.07.2009	1803 (अ) 22.07.2009	03.12.2009	3095 (अ) 03.12.2009	24.04.2012
52.	छन	चाचौड़ा	22.07.2009	1803 (अ) 22.07.2009	03.12.2009	3095 (अ) 03.12.2009	19.03.2012
53.	महेशपुरा	चाचौड़ा	22.07.2009	1803 (अ) 22.07.2009	03.12.2009	3095 (अ) 03.12.2009	25.04.2012
54.	बीजनीपुरा	चाचौड़ा	22.07.2009	1803 (अ) 22.07.2009	03.12.2009	3095 (अ) 03.12.2009	19.03.2012
55.	जयर्सिंहपुरा	चाचौड़ा	22.07.2009	1803 (अ) 22.07.2009	03.12.2009	3095 (अ) 03.12.2009	19.03.2012
56.	चारनपुरा	चाचौड़ा	08.01.2010	37 (अ) 08.01.2010	03.04.2010	746 (अ) 03.04.2010	08.11.2011
57.	खेजडाखुर्द	चाचौड़ा	22.07.2009	1803 (अ) 22.07.2009	03.12.2009	3095 (अ) 03.12.2009	13.09.2011
58.	रमड़ा	चाचौड़ा	22.07.2009	1803 (अ) 22.07.2009	03.12.2009	3095 (अ) 03.12.2009	08.11.2011
59.	रमड़ी	चाचौड़ा	19.04.2011	764 (अ) 19.04.2011	03.04.2010	746 (अ) 03.04.2010	24.04.2012

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
60.	बरखेडीमाफी	कुम्भराज	22.07.2009	1803 (अ) 22.07.2009	03.12.2009	3095 (अ) 03.12.2009	13.09.2011
61.	ईंटखेडीकला	कुम्भराज	22.07.2009	1803 (अ) 22.07.2009	11.12.2009	3183 (अ) 10.12.2009	12.09.2011
62.	सिहारी	कुम्भराज	22.07.2009	1803 (अ) 22.07.2009	11.12.2009	3183 (अ) 10.12.2009	12.09.2011
63.	अलीखेडी	कुम्भराज	22.07.2009	1803 (अ) 22.07.2009	11.12.2009	3183 (अ) 10.12.2009	12.09.2011
64.	खेजडाबेहरा	कुम्भराज	22.07.2009	1803 (अ) 22.07.2009	11.12.2009	3183 (अ) 10.12.2009	19.03.2012
65.	तुलसीखेडी	कुम्भराज	22.07.2009	1803 (अ) 22.07.2009	11.12.2009	3183 (अ) 10.12.2009	19.03.2012
66.	ऊपरी	कुम्भराज	22.07.2009	1803 (अ) 22.07.2009	11.12.2009	3183 (अ) 10.12.2009	19.03.2012
67.	मानपुरा	कुम्भराज	22.07.2009	1803 (अ) 22.07.2009	11.12.2009	3183 (अ) 10.12.2009	13.09.2011
68.	सांकाकला	राघौगढ	22.07.2009	1803 (अ) 22.07.2009	11.12.2009	3183 (अ) 10.12.2009	13.09.2011
69.	बेहराखेडी	राघौगढ	22.07.2009	1803 (अ) 22.07.2009	18.03.2010	613 (अ) 18.03.2010	08.11.2011
70.	बर्या	राघौगढ	22.07.2009	1803 (अ) 22.07.2009	19.01.2010	113 (अ) 19.01.2010	08.11.2011
71.	आवन	राघौगढ	22.07.2009	1803 (अ) 22.07.2009	19.01.2010	113 (अ) 19.01.2010	08.11.2011
72.	भैसाना	राघौगढ	22.07.2009	1803 (अ) 22.07.2009	19.01.2010	113 (अ) 19.01.2010	08.11.2011
73.	चेटरवर्डी	राघौगढ	22.07.2009	1803 (अ) 22.07.2009	19.01.2010	113 (अ) 19.01.2010	04.05.2012
74.	अहीरखेडी	राघौगढ	22.07.2009	1803 (अ) 22.07.2009	19.01.2010	113 (अ) 19.01.2010	19.03.2012
75.	अहमदपुरं	राघौगढ	22.07.2009	1803 (अ) 22.07.2009	19.01.2010	113 (अ) 19.01.2010	24.04.2012
76.	हुसेनपुरं	राघौगढ	22.07.2009	1803 (अ) 22.07.2009	19.01.2010	113 (अ) 19.01.2010	08.04.2011

[फासं एल-14014/23/2014-जी पी]  
एसंपी अग्रवाल, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 29th April, 2014

S.O. 1306.—In pursuance of the proviso to sub-rule (i) of rule 4 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Rules, 1963, framed under section 17 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Competent Authority, GAIL (India) Limited with whom the right of user in the land in that area has been vested or ownership of the pipeline in that area vests as the case may be, hereby declares the date of termination of operation of laying Dahej - Vemar - Vijaipur pipeline project in Madhya Pradesh State as mentioned in column - 8 of the Schedule below, namely:—

#### ANNEXURE-1

#### SCHEDULE

Sr.No.	Name of Village	Tehsil	Notification Under section 3(1)		Notification Under section 6(1)		Date of Termination of operations
			Date of Publication of Gazette	S.O.No. & Date	Date of Publication of Gazette	S.O.No. & Date	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
1.	Sandavta	Sarangpur	11.06.2009	1449(A)10.06.2009	10.11.2009	2858(A) 10.11.2009	5.08.2011
2.	Khanjarpur	Sarangpur	11.06.2009	1449(A)10.06.2009	10.11.2009	2858(A)10.11.2009	12.09.2011
3.	Barkhedikhuram	Sarangpur	11.06.2009	1449(A)10.06.2009	10.11.2009	2858(A)10.11.2009	15.09.2011
4.	Ghatakhedi	Sarangpur	11.06.2009	1449(A)10.06.2009	10.11.2009	2858(A)10.11.2009	15.09.2011
5.	Rasulpura	Rajgad	11.06.2009	1449(A)10.06.2009	10.11.2009	2858(A)10.11.2009	28.12.2011

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
6.	Kalponi	Rajgad	11.06.2009	1449(A)10.06.2009	10.11.2009	2858(A)10.11.2009	21.09.2011
7.	Paddaliya Khedi	Rajgad	11.06.2009	1449(A)10.06.2009	10.11.2009	2858(A)10.11.2009	21.09.2011
8.	Chonsla	Rajgad	11.06.2009	1449(A)10.06.2009	10.11.2009	2858(A)10.11.2009	21.04.2012
9.	Tumadiyakhedi	Rajgad	11.06.2009	1449(A)10.06.2009	10.11.2009	2858(A)10.11.2009	20.06.2012
10.	Guradiya	Rajgad	11.06.2009	1449(A)10.06.2009	10.11.2009	2858(A)10.11.2009	20.06.2012
11.	Khajuri	Rajgad	11.06.2009	1449(A)10.06.2009	10.11.2009	2858(A)10.11.2009	20.06.2012
12.	Gorakhpura	Rajgad	22.06.2009	1804(A)22.06.2009	10.11.2009	2858(A)10.11.2009	08.04.2011
13.	Kishanpuriya-1	Rajgad	11.06.2009	1449(A)10.06.2009	10.11.2009	2858(A)10.11.2009	20.06.2012
14.	Kundibeh 1	Rajgad	08.01.2010	37(A)08.01.2010	03.04.2010	746(A)03.04.2010	19.09.2011
15.	Lalpura	Rajgad	11.06.2009	1449(A)10.06.2009	10.11.2009	2858(A)10.11.2009	21.04.2012
16.	Mohlampura	Rajgad	22.09.2009	2421(A)22.09.2009	19.01.2010	113(A)19.01.2010	13.12.2011
17.	Ranipura	Rajgad	11.06.2009	1449(A)10.06.2009	10.11.2009	2858(A)10.11.2009	19.09.2011
18.	Dalelpura	Rajgad	11.06.2009	1449(A)10.06.2009	10.11.2009	2858(A)10.11.2009	15.09.2011
19.	Chainpuriya	Rajgad	11.06.2009	1449(A)10.06.2009	10.11.2009	2858(A)10.11.2009	13.09.2011
20.	Salpura	Rajgad	22.09.2009	2421(A)22.09.2009	10.11.2009	2858(A)10.11.2009	26.11.2011
21.	Saangi	Rajgad	11.06.2009	1449(A)10.06.2009	10.11.2009	2858(A)10.11.2009	21.04.2011
22.	Sawankheda	Rajgad	11.06.2009	1449(A)10.06.2009	10.11.2009	2858(A)10.11.2009	22.04.2012
23.	Pura	Rajgad	11.06.2009	1449(A)10.06.2009	10.11.2009	2858(A)10.11.2009	21.04.2012
24.	Bhadvakheda	Rajgad	11.06.2009	1449(A)10.06.2009	10.11.2009	2858(A)10.11.2009	20.09.2011
25.	Kishanpuriya 2	Rajgad	11.06.2009	1449(A)10.06.2009	10.11.2009	2858(A)10.11.2009	21.04.2011
26.	Rampuria	Rajgad	11.06.2009	1449(A)10.06.2009	10.11.2009	2858(A)10.11.2009	21.04.2011
27.	Rajlibe	Rajgad	11.06.2009	1449(A)10.06.2009	10.11.2009	2858(A)10.11.2009	20.09.2011
28.	Pipalbe	Rajgad	11.06.2009	1449(A)10.06.2009	10.11.2009	2858(A)10.11.2009	19.04.2012
29.	Hirankhedi	Rajgad	22.07.2009	1804(A)22.07.2009	10.11.2009	2858(A)10.11.2009	28.12.2011
30.	Ghoghadiyakala	Rajgad	11.06.2009	1449(A)10.06.2009	10.11.2009	2858(A)10.11.2009	09.11.2011
31.	Ghoghadiyakhurd	Rajgad	11.06.2009	1449(A)10.06.2009	10.11.2009	2858(A)10.11.2009	09.11.2011
32.	Golyave	Rajgad	22.07.2009	1804(A)22.07.2009	10.11.2009	2858(A)10.11.2009	24.01.2012
33.	Kalipith	Rajgad	11.06.2009	1449(A)10.06.2009	10.11.2009	2858(A)10.11.2009	21.04.2012
34.	Bnaniya	Radgad	11.06.2009	1449(A) 10.06.2009	10.11.2009	2858(A) 10.11.2009	20.09.2011
35.	Lalatalai	Rajgad	11.06.2009	1449(A)10.06.2009	10.11.2009	2858(A) 10.11.2009	19.04.2012
36.	Bajpura	Rajgad	11.06.2009	1449(A) 10.06.2009	10.11.2009	2858(A) 10.11.2009	19.04.2012
37.	Kundibeh 2	Rajgad	11.06.2009	1449(A) 10.06.2009	10.11.2009	2858(A) 10.11.2009	24.01.2012
38.	Mahubabe	Rajgad	11.06.2009	1449(A) 10.06.2009	10.11.2009	2858(A) 10.11.2009	24.01.2012
39.	Jodakia	Rajgad	11.06.2009	1449(A) 10.06.2009	10.11.2009	2858(A) 10.11.2009	19.04.2012
40.	Suwaheri	Rajgad	11.06.2009	1449(A) 10.06.2009	10.11.2009	2858(A) 10.11.2012	19.04.2012
41.	Jalalpura	Rajgad	11.06.2009	1449(A) 10.06.2009	10.11.2009	2858(A) 10.11.2009	21.04.2012

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
42	Sonahera	Chachoda	22.07.2009	1803 (A) 22.07.2009	03.12.2009	3095 (A) 03.12.2009	24.04.2012
43	Sigapura	Chachoda	22.06.2009	1803 (A) 22.06.2009	03.12.2009	3095 (A) 03.12.2009	13.09.2011
44	Nesh Khurd	Chachoda	22.07.2009	1803 (A) 22.07.2009	03.12.2009	3095 (A) 03.12.2009	25.08.2011
45	Netya Khedi	Chachoda	22.07.2009	1803 (A) 22.07.2009	03.12.2009	3095 (A) 03.12.2009	26.11.2011
46	Jhordha	Chachoda	03.04.2010	743 (A) 03.04.2010	03.12.2009	3095 (A) 03.12.2009	03.04.2011
47	Mohammadpur	Chachoda	22.07.2009	1803A22.07.2009	03.12.2009	3095(A) 03.12.2009	19.03.2012
48	Gunjari	Chachoda	22.07.2009	1803 (A) 22.07.2009	03.12.2009	3095 (A) 03.12.2009	18.03.2012
49	Muhashkala	Chachoda	22.07.2009	1803 (A) 22.07.2009	03.12.2009	3095 (A) 03.12.2009	19.03.2012
50	Polash	Chachoda	22.07.2009	1803 (A) 22.07.2009	03.12.2009	3095 (A) 03.12.2009	18.03.2012
51	Chachoda	Chachoda	22.07.2009	1803 (A) 22.07.2009	03.12.2009	3095 (A) 03.12.2009	24.04.2012
52	Chhan	Chachoda	22.07.2009	1803 (A) 22.07.2009	03.12.2009	3095 (A) 03.12.2009	19.03.2012
53	Mahespura	Chachoda	22.07.2009	1803 (A) 22.07.2009	03.12.2009	3095 (A) 03.12.2009	25.04.2012
54	Bijnipur	Chachoda	22.07.2009	1803 (A) 22.07.2009	03.12.2009	3095 (A) 03.12.2009	19.03.2012
55	Jyishingh	Chachoda	22.07.2009	1803 (A) 22.07.2009	03.12.2009	3095 (A) 03.12.2009	19.03.2012
56	Charanpura	Chachoda	08.01.2010	37 (A) 08.01.2010	03.04.2010	746 (A) 03.04.2010	08.11.2011
57	Khejda Khurd	Chachoda	22.07.2009	1803 (A) 22.07.2009	03.12.2009	3095 (A) 03.12.2009	13.09.2011
58	Ramra	Chachoda	22.07.2009	1803 (A) 22.07.2009	03.12.2009	3095 (A) 03.12.2009	08.11.2011
59	Ramrima	Chachoda	19.04.2011	764 (A) 19.04.2011	03.04.2010	746 (A) 03.04.2010	24.04.2012
60	Barkherima	Chachoda	22.07.2009	1803 (A) 22.07.2009	03.12.2009	3095 (A) 03.12.2009	13.09.2011
61	Intkherima	Kumbhraj	22.07.2009	1803 (A) 22.07.2009	11.12.2009	3183(A) 10.12.2009	12.09.2011
62	Sihari	Kumbhraj	22.07.2009	1803 (A) 22.07.2009	11.12.2009	3183 (A) 10.12.2009	12.09.2011
63	Allikheri	Kumbhraj	22.07.2009	1803 (A) 22.07.2009	11.12.2009	3183 (A) 10.12.2009	12.09.2011
64	Kherja Behra	Kumbhraj	22.07.2009	1803 (A) 22.07.2009	11.12.2009	3183 (A) 10.12.2009	19.03.2012
65	Tulsikheri	Kumbhraj	22.07.2009	1803 (A) 22.07.2009	10.12.2009	3183 (A) 10.12.2009	19.03.2012
66	Upri	Kumbhraj	22.07.2009	1803 (A) 22.07.2009	11.12.2009	3183 (A) 10.12.2009	19.03.2012
67	Manpura	Kumbhraj	22.07.2009	1803 (A) 22.07.2009	11.12.2009	3183 (A) 10.12.2009	13.09.2011
68	Sanka Kalan	Kumbhraj	22.07.2009	1803 (A) 22.07.2009	11.12.2009	3183 (A) 10.12.2009	13.09.2011
69	Behra kheri	Raghogad	22.07.2009	1803 (A) 22.07.2009	18.03.2010	613 (A) 18.03.2010	08.11.2011
70	Barya	Raghogad	22.07.2009	1803 (A) 22.07.2009	19.01.2010	113 (A) 19.01.2010	08.11.2011
71	Awan	Raghogad	22.07.2009	1803 (A) 22.07.2009	19.01.2010	113 (A) 19.01.2010	08.11.2011
72.	Bhesana	Raghogad	22.07.2009	1803 (A) 22.07.2009	19.01.2010	113(A) 19.01.2010	08.11.2011
73.	Chetabari	Raghogad	22.07.2009	1803 (A) 22.07.2009	19.01.2010	113(A) 19.01.2010	04.05.2011
74.	Ahirkheri	Raghogad	22.07.2009	1803 (A) 22.07.2009	19.01.2010	113(A) 19.01.2010	19.03.2012
75.	Ahmedpur	Raghogad	22.07.2009	1803 (A) 22.07.2009	19.01.2010	113(A) 19.01.2010	24.04.2012
76.	Husenpur	Raghogad	22.07.2009	1803 (A) 22.07.2009	19.01.2010	113(A) 19.01.2010	08.04.2011

[F. No. L-14014/23/2014-G.P.]

S. P. AGARWAL, Under Secy.

## वस्त्र मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 30 अप्रैल, 2014

**का०आ० 1307.**—केन्द्रीय सरकार, (संघ के शासकीय प्रयोजनों के लिए) राजभाषा नियम, 1976 के नियम 10 के उपनियम (4) के अनुसरण में, वस्त्र मंत्रालय के अंतर्गत आने वाले निम्नलिखित कार्यालयों को जिसके 80% से अधिक कर्मचारियों ने हिन्दी का कार्यसाधक ज्ञान प्राप्त कर लिया है, अधिसूचित करती हैः—

1. रेशम जैव प्रौद्योगिकी अनुसंधान प्रयोगशाला, केन्द्रीय रेशम बोर्ड, कारमेलराम डाक, कोड्डी बेगलुरु-560 035 (कर्नाटक)
2. अनुसंधान विस्तार केंद्र, केरेअवप्रसं, केन्द्रीय रेशम बोर्ड, रंगपो-737132 (सिक्किम)
3. क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय, केन्द्रीय रेशम बोर्ड, 18-सत्यनगर, भुवनेश्वर-751007 (ओडिशा)

[सं०ई० 11016/1/2011-हिन्दी]  
सुनयना तोमर, संयुक्त सचिव

## MINISTRY OF TEXTILES

New Delhi, 30th April, 2014

**S.O. 1307.**—In pursuance of sub-Rule (4) of Rule 10 of the Official Languages (use for the official purpose of the Union) Rules, 1976, the Central Government, hereby notifies the following offices of the Ministry of Textiles, more than 80% staff whereof have acquired working knowledge of Hindi:—

1. Seri Biotech Research Laboratory, Central Silk Board, Carmelram Post, Kodathi, Bengaluru-560035 Karnataka.
2. Research Extention Centre, CSR&TI, Cntral Silk Board, Rangpo-737132 Sikkim.
3. Regional Office, Central Silk Board, 18-Satyanagar, Bhubaneswar-751007 Orissa.

[No. E. 11016/1/2011-Hindi]

SUNAINA TOMAR, Jt. Secy.

## कोयला मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 2 मई 2014

**का०आ० 1308.**—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित परिक्षेत्र की भूमि में से कोयला अभिप्राप्त किए जाने की संभावना है;

और उक्त अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि के क्षेत्र का व्यौरा अंतर्विष्ट करने वाले रेखांक संख्यांक आरईवी/01/2014, तारीख 15 जनवरी, 2014 का निरीक्षण सेंट्रल कोलफील्ड्स लिमिटेड (भूमि और राजस्व

विभाग) दरभंगा हाउस, रांची- 834929 (झारखंड) के कार्यालय में या महाप्रबंधक, सेंट्रल कोलफील्ड्स लिमिटेड, मगध एवं आम्रपाली, जिला चतरा (झारखंड), के कार्यालय में या उपायुक्त जिला चतरा झारखंड या महाप्रबंधक (खोज प्रभार) आरआई-III, केन्द्रीय खान योजना एवं डिजाइन संस्थान, गोडवाना प्लेस, कांके रोड, रांची (झारखंड) के कार्यालय में या कोयला नियन्त्रक, 1, काउंसिल हाउस स्ट्रीट, कोलकाता-700001 के कार्यालय में किया जा सकता है।

अतः अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, कोयला धारक क्षेत्र (अर्जन और विकास) अधिनियम, 1957 (1957 का 20) जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त अधिनियम कहा गया है, की धारा 4 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए पूर्वोक्त अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में कोयले का पूर्वेक्षण करने के अपने आशय की सूचना देती है।

उपर्युक्त वर्णित अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में हितबद्ध कोई व्यक्ति इस अधिसूचना के प्रकाशन की तारीख से नब्बे दिन के भीतर महाप्रबंधक, सेंट्रल कोलफील्ड्स लिमिटेड, मगध एवं आम्रपाली क्षेत्र, जिला चतरा (झारखंड) या महाप्रबंधक, सेंट्रल कोलफील्ड्स लिमिटेड, भूमि और राजस्व विभाग, दरभंगा हाउस, रांची-834029 (झारखंड) को—

- (i) उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 4 की उप धारा (3) के अधीन की गई कार्रवाई से हुई क्षति या संभाव्य होने वाली किसी क्षति के लिए अधिनियम की धारा 6 के अधीन प्रतिकर का दावा कर सकेगा; और
- (ii) उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 13 की उप धारा (1) के अधीन समाप्त हो गए खनन पट्टे के लिए प्रतिकार का दावा कर सकेगा और उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 13 की उप धारा (1) के खंड(i) से खंड(iv) में विनिर्दिष्ट मर्दों की बाबत् उपगत व्यय को उपदर्शित करने के लिए उक्त भूमि से संबंधित सभी मानचित्रों, चार्टों और अन्य दस्तावेजों को परिदृत कर सकेगा।

## अनुसूची

आम्रपाली विस्तार खुली खदान परियोजना

जिला-चतरा, झारखंड

(रेखाक संख्यांक आरईवी/01/2014, तारीख 15 जनवरी, 2014)

क्र०	ग्राम	थाना	थाना	जिला	क्षेत्र	क्षेत्र	टिप्पणी
सं०			नं०		(एकड़)	(हेक्टेयर)	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1.	होनहे	टंडवा	50/207	चतरा	210.00	85.02	भाग
2.	कुमरांग	टंडवा	51/208	चतरा	393.78	159.1	भाग
				खुर्द			

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
3.	कुमरांग	टंडवा	52/209	चतरा	147.99	59.91	भाग कलां
4.	उरसू	टंडवा	54/211	चतरा	294.78	119.34	भाग
			कुल:	1046.55	423.37		

**सीमा का वर्णनः**

क—ख रेखा बिन्दु 'क' से अराम्भ होकर ग्राम कोयद में होनहे के सम्मिलित सीमा से गुजरती हुई रेखा बिन्दु 'ख' पर मिलती है।

ख—ग रेखा बिन्दु 'ख' गरीया नदी के मध्य रेखा से गुजरती हुई बिन्दु 'ग' पर मिलती है।

ग—घ रेखा बिन्दु 'ग' गरीया नदी के मध्य रेखा से गुजरती हुई बिन्दु 'घ' पर मिलती है।

घ—क रेखा बिन्दु 'घ' ग्राम उरसू, कुमरांग कला, कुमरांग खुर्द और होनहे से गुजरती हुई आरंभक बिन्दु 'क' पर मिलती है।

[फा० सं० 43015/2/2014—पीआरआईडब्ल्यू-I]

दोमिनिक डुंगडुंग, अवर सचिव

**MINISTRY OF COAL**

New Delhi, the 2nd May, 2014

**S.O. 1308.**—Whereas, it appears to the Central Government that coal is likely to be obtained from the land in the locality described in the Schedule annexed hereto;

And, whereas the plan bearing number Rev/01/2014, dated the 15th January, 2014 containing details of the areas of land described in the said Schedule may be inspected at the office of the Central Coalfields Limited (Land and Revenue Department), Darbhanga House, Ranchi-834 029 (Jharkhand) or at the office of the General Manager, Central Coalfields Limited, Magadh and Amrapali, District Chatra (Jharkhand), Deputy Commissioner, District Chatra, Jharkhand or at the office of the General Manager (Exploration Division), RI-III, Central Mine Planning and Design Institute, Gondwana Palace, Kanke Road, Ranchi (Jharkhand) or at the office of the Coal Controller, 1, Council House Street, Kolkata-700 001.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 4 of the Coal Bearing Areas (Acquisition and Development), Act, 1957 (20 of 1957), hereinafter referred to as the said Act, the Central Government hereby gives notice of its intention to prospect for coal in land described in the aforesaid Schedule.

Any person interested in the land described in the above mentioned Schedule may:—

- (i) claim compensation under section 6 of the said Act for any damage caused or likely to be caused by any action under sub-section (3) of section 4 of the said Act; or
- (ii) claim compensation under sub-section (1) of section 13 of the said Act in respect of prospecting license ceasing to have effect or under sub-section (4) of section 13 of the said Act for mining lease ceasing to have effect and deliver all maps, charts and other documents relating to the aforesaid land to show the expenditure incurred in respect of items specified in clauses (i) to (iv) to sub-section (1) of section 13 of said Act, to the office of the General Manager, Central Coalfields Limited, Magadh and Amrapali Area, District Chatra (Jharkhand) or General Manager, Central Coalfields Limited, Land and Revenue Department, Darbhanga House, Ranchi-834029 (Jharkhand) within a period of ninety days from the date of publication of this notification.

**SCHEDULE**

Amapali Extension Opencast Project

District-Chatra, Jharkhand

(plan bearing number Rev/01/2014, dated the  
15th January, 2014)

Sl. No.	Village	Thana	Thana	District	Area (Acres)	Area (Hectares)	Remarks
1.	Honhe	Tandwa	50/207	Chatra	210.00	85.02	Part
2.	Kumarang	Tandwa	51/208	Chatra	393.78	159.1	Part Kurd
3.	Kumarang	Tandwa	52/209	Chatra	147.99	59.91	Part Kalan
4.	Ursu	Tandwa	54/211	Chatra	294.78	119.34	Part
					Total	1046.55	423.37

**Boundary Description:—**

- A-B Line starts from 'A' and passes through common boundary of village koed and Honhe and meets at point 'B'.
- B-C Line passes through centre line of Garuia Nadi and meets at point 'C'.
- C-D Line passes through centre line of Garuia Nadi and meets at points 'D'.
- D-A line passes through village Ursu, Kumarang Kalan, Kumarang Khurd and Honhe and meets at starting point 'A'.

[F.No. 43015/2/2014-PRIW-1]

DOMINIC DUNGDUNG, Under Secy.

## श्रम एवं रोजगार मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 21 अप्रैल, 2014

का.आ. 1309.— औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एफ़सीआई के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय नं° 2, धनबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 141/2013) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 21/04/2014 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-22011/6/2013-आईआर (सीएम-II)]

बी.एम. पटनायक, डेस्क अधिकारी

## MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT

New Delhi, the 21st April, 2014

**S.O.1309.**—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 141/2013) of the Cent. Govt. Indus. Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, No. 2, Dhanbad as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of FCT, FSD, at PO/Dt.-Gumla, Food Corporation of India, Mahabir Tower, and their workmen, received by the Central Government on 21/04/2014

[No. L-22011/6/2013-IR(CM-II)]

B.M. PATNAIK, Desk Officer

## ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT  
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) AT DHANBAD.

## PRESENT:

SHRI KISHORI RAM, Presiding Officer.

In the matter of an Industrial Dispute under Section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act., 1947.

## REFERENCE NO. 141 OF 2013.

**PARTIES :** The General Secretary,  
F.C.I. Workers Union.  
58/1, Diamond Harbour Road,  
Kolkata-23.  
Vs

General Manager, Food Corporation of India, Ranchi

## APPEARANCES:

On behalf of the workman/ : Mr. Ghanshyam Jena  
union Union Representative

On behalf of the : None  
Management

State JHARKHAND

Industry: Consumer Affairs, Food and Pub. Distribution

Dhanbad, dated the 7th March, 2013

## AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour, in exercise of the powers conferred on them under Sec. 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act., 1947 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication *vide* their Order No L-22011/6/2013-IR(CM-II) dt. 10.06.2013.

## SCHEDULE

"Whether the actions of the Management of Food Corporation of India in denying wages for the period 03.02.2012 to 13.06.2012 and consequential benefits to Sri Fundan Sao and 43 other workmen under No work No Pay System (List enclosed) after their transfer from FSD, Suriya Godown to FCI, FSD, Gumla Depot are legal and justified? If not, what relief including costs and incidental to, the workmen are entitled to?

2. Shri Birendra Rai, the workmen under Sl. No. 44 out of the total workmen 44 as per the list enclosed is present and by filing a petition (in duplicate) dt 31.1.2014 duly under the signature of Shri Ghanshyam Jena, the General Secretary, the FCI Workers Union, Diamond Harbour Road, Kolkata, has submitted that the Union does not want to pursue the instant Industrial Dispute for the reasons that the amicable settlement is in process between both the parties, so it needs to be withdrawn. On the other hand, despite Regd. Notices neither the Manager, FCI, FSD, PO:/ Distt. Gumla, nor the General Manager, FCI, Mahavir Tower, 9th Floor, Main Road, Ranchi, both Jharkhand, appeared in this case.

Since the Union Representative is reluctant to pursue the Reference case in view of the process of settlement going between both the parties, the case is closed as non-existence of the Industrial Dispute; accordingly an order of No Dispute is passed.

KISHORI RAM, Presiding Officer

## List of the 44 workers

Sl. No.	Name of worker 02	Sl. No.	Name of worker 02
01	02	01	02
1	Fudan Sao	2	Heman Yadav
3	Ramdeo Sao	4	Khuban Sao
5	Md. Kamruddin Mian	6	Kalia Sao
7	Bandhan Mahto	8	Churaman Gope
9	Binod Sao	10	Bedo Gope
11	Md. Khalil Mian	12	Sahdeo Sao
13	Laxman Yadav	14	Md. Habib Mian
15	Bhawani Thakur	16	Dukhan Yadav
17	Basudeo Sao	18	Laxman Sao
19	Shaymlal Sao	20	Md. Jumman Mian
21	Bhudan Gope	22	Ishwar Sao
23	Santan Sao	24	Sewa Sao
25	Mahesh Sao	26	Mahru Sao
27	Bhagirath Yadav	28	Chhotan Singh
29	Tek Lal Gope	30	Md. Badruddin Mian
31	Bhikho Sao	32	Chander Sao
33	Md. Siddique Mian	34	Ramdeo Sao
35	Rameshwar Sao	36	Sukhdeo Sao
37	Raghunath Sao	38	Somar Sao
39	Dhupal Sao	40	Ashok Sao
41	Bhagirath Sao	42	Surendra Sao
43	Rajender Sao	44	Birendra Rai

नई दिल्ली, 22 अप्रैल, 2014

**का.आ. 1310.—** औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एस०सी०सी०एल० के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध 1 में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/अमन्यायालय, हैदराबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 70/2013) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 22/04/2014 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं.एल० 22012/75/2013-आई आर (सी एम-II)]

बी०एम० पटनायक, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 22nd April, 2014

**S.O. 1310.—** In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 70/2013) of the Cent. Govt. Indus. Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Hyderabad as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of M/s. Singareni Collieries Co. Ltd., and their workmen, received by the Central Government on 22/04/2014.

[No. L-22012/75/2013-IR(CM-II)]

B.M. PATNAIK, Desk Officer

**ANNEXURE****BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT  
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT  
AT HYDERABAD****Present :** SMT.M.VIJAYAAKSHMI, Presiding Officer

Dated the 30th day of January, 2014

**INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. I.D. 70/2013****Between:**

The President,  
(Sri Bandari Satyanarayana)  
Telangana Trade Union Council,  
H.No. 5-295, Indra Nagar,  
Opp. Bus Stand, Mancherial,  
Adilabad Dist.-504208. . . .Petitioner  
AND.  
The General Manager,  
M/s. Singareni Collieries Company Limited,  
Bellampalli Area, Goleti Township (P.O.)  
Adilabad Dist.-504292. . . .Respondent

**APPEARANCES:**

For the Petitioner : NIL

For the Respondent : M/s. P.A.V.V.S. Sarma &  
V.S.V.S.R.K.S. Prasad, Advocates**AWARD**

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. L-22012/75/2013-IR(CM-II) dated 8.7.2013 referred the following dispute between the management of M/s. Singareni Collieries Company Ltd., and their workman under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 for adjudication to this Tribunal. The reference is,

**SCHEDULE**

"Whether the action of the management of General Manager of M/s. Singareni Collieries Company Ltd., Bellampalli Area, Goleti Township (P.O.), Adilabad Distt., in terminating the services of Sri Ratnam Venkati, Ex-General Mazdoor, Goleti-1, SCCo Ltd., Bellampalli Area with effect from 21.5.2007 is justified or not? If not, to what relief the applicant is entitled for?"

The reference is numbered in this Tribunal as I.D. No. 70/2013 and notices were issued to the parties.

2. The case stands posted for filing of claim statement and documents.

3. Petitioner called absent and there is no representation. Inspite of receiving notice twice, Petitioner is not appearing and taking interest in the proceedings. In the circumstances, taking that Petitioner got no claim to be made, 'Nil' award is passed.

Award passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. P. Phani Gowri, Personal Assistant, corrected by me on this the 30th day of January, 2014.

M. VIJAYA LAKSHMI, Presiding Officer

**Appendix of evidence**

Witnesses examined for the Petitioner  
Witnesses examined for the Respondent

Petitioner	Respondent
NIL	NIL

**Documents marked for the Petitioner**

NIL

**Documents marked for the Respondent**

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 22 अप्रैल, 2014

**का०आ०. 1311.—**ओद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार एस० सी० सी० एल० के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट ओद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार ओद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद के पंचाट संदर्भ संख्या (18/2013) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 22.04.2014 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं० एल०-22012/202/2012-आईआर (सी० एम०-II)]

बी०एम० पटनायक, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 22nd April, 2014

**S.O. 1311.—**In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central

Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 18/2013) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court Hyderabad as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of M/s. Singareni Collieries Co. Ltd., and their workman, received by the Central Government on 22.04.2014.

[No. L-22012/202/2012-IR(CM-II)]

B.M. PATNAIK, Desk Officer

**ANNEXURE****BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT  
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT AT  
HYDERABAD**

**PRESENT:** Smt. M. VIJAYA LAKSHMI, Presiding Officer

Dated, the 19th day of March, 2014

**Industrial Dispute No. I.D. 18/2013**

**Between:**

The President,

(Sri Bandari Satyanarayana)

Telangana Trade Union Council,

H.No.- 5-295, Indra Nagar,

Opp. Bus Stand, Mancherial,

Adilabad Dist. - 504208 ..... Petitioner

**AND**

The General Manager,

M/s. Singareni Collieries Company Limited,

Sreerampur Area, Sreerampur,

Adilabad Distt.-504303 ..... Respondent

**APPEARANCES:**

For the Petitioner : NIL

For the Respondent : M/s. P.A.V.V.S. Sarma & Vijaya Lakshmi Panguluri, Advocates

**AWARD**

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. L-22012/202/2012-IR(CM-II) dated 30.11.2012 referred the following dispute between the management of M/s. Singareni Collieries Company Ltd., and their workman under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 for adjudication to this Tribunal, The reference is :

### SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the Chief General Manager, M/s. Singareni Collieries Company Ltd., Sreerampur Area, Sreerampur, Adilabad District in terminating the services of Shri Kotrangi Madhu, Ex-Coal Filler, RK-8 Inc., SCCL, Sreerampur Area with effect from 1.5.2005 is justified or not? To what relief the applicant is entitled for?"

The reference is numbered in this Tribunal as I.D. No. 18/2013 and notices were issued to the parties.

2. The case stand posted for filing of claim statement and documents.

3. Petitioner called absent and there is no representation. Claim statement not filed. Inspite of giving fair opportunity again and again Petitioner is not taking interest in the proceedings and is not making any claim. In the circumstances, taking that there is no claim to be made, 'Nil' award is passed.

Award passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. P. Phani Gowari, Personal Assistant, corrected by me on this the 19th day of March, 2014.

M. VIJAYA LAKSHMI, Presiding Officer

### Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the Petitioner      Witnesses examined for the Respondent

NIL      NIL

### Documents marked for the Petitioner

NIL

### Documents marked for the Respondent

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 22 अप्रैल, 2014

**का०आ० 1312.—ऑद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार एस०सी०सी०एल० के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट ऑद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार ऑद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 20/2013) को प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 22/04/2014 को प्राप्त हुआ था।**

[सं० एल-22012/208/2012-आईआर(सीएम-II)]

बी. एम. पटनायक, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 22nd April, 2014

**S.O. 1312.—**In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central

Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 20/2013) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, Hyderabad as shown in the Annexure in the industrial dispute between the management of M/s Singareni Collieries Co. Ltd., and their workmen, received by the Central Government on 22/04/2014.

[No. L-22012/208/2012-IR(CM-II)]  
B.M. PATNAIK, Desk Officer

### ANNEXURE

### BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD

**PRESENT:**      Smt. M. VIJAYA LAKSHMI, Presiding Officer

Dated, the 19th day of March, 2014

**Industrial Dispute No. I.D. 20/2013**

### BETWEEN:

The President,  
(Sri Bandari Satyanarayana)  
Telangana Trade Union Council,  
H.No.- 5-295, Indra Nagar,  
Opp. Bus Stand, Mancherial,  
Adilabad Dist. - 504208                         .....Petitioner

### AND

The General Manager,  
M/s. Singareni Collieries Company Limited,  
Bellampalli Area, Goleti Township,  
Adilabad Distt.-504292                         ....Respondent

### APPEARANCE:

For the Petitioner : Nil  
For the Respondent : M/s P.A.V.V.S. Sarma & Vijaya Lakhsmi Panguluri, Advocates

### AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. L-22012/208/2012-IR(CM-II) Dated 4.12.2012 referred the following dispute between the management of M/s. Singareni Collieries Company Ltd. and their workman under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 for adjudication to this Tribunal. The reference is :

### SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the Chief General Manager of M/s. Singareni Collieries Company Ltd., Bellampally Area, Goleti Township , Adilabad

District in disempanelling Shri Gajjeli Posham, Ex-Coal Filler, MVK-5 Inc., SCCL, Bellampalli Area with effect from 22.10.1999 is justified or not? To what relief the applicant is entitled for?"

The reference is numbered in this Tribunal as I.D. No. 20/2013 and notices were issued to the parties.

2. The case stands posted for filing of claim statement and documents.

3. Petitioner called absent and there is no representation. Claim statement not filed. Inspite of giving fair opportunity again and again Petitioner is not taking interest in the proceedings and is not making any claim. In the circumstances, taking that there is no claim to be made, 'Nil' award is passed.

Award passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. P. Phani Gowri, Personal Assistant, corrected by me on this the 19th day of March, 2014.

M. VIJAYA LAKSHMI, Presiding Officer

#### **Appendix of evidence**

Witnesses examined for the Witnesses examined for the

Petitioner	Respondent
NIL	NIL

#### **Documents marked for the Petitioner**

NIL

#### **Documents marked for the Respondent**

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 22 अप्रैल, 2014

**का०आ० 1313.—**औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एस०सी०सी०एल० के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध 1 में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय हैदराबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 21/2013) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 22/04/2014 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं० एल-22012/209/2012-आई आर (सीएम II)]  
बी० एम० पटनायक, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 22nd April, 2014

**S.O. 1313.—**In Pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 21/2013) of the Cent. Govt. Indus.Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Hyderabad as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial

dispute between the management of M/s. Singareni Collieries Co. Ltd., and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 22/04/2014.

[No. L-22012/209/2012-IR(CM-II)]

B. M. PATNAIK, Desk Officer

#### **ANNEXURE**

#### **BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD**

**PRESENT:** SMT. M. VIJAYA LAKSHMI, Presiding Officer

Dated the 19th day of March, 2014

**INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. I.D. 21/2013**

#### **BETWEEN:**

The President,  
(Sri Bandari Satyanarayana)  
Telangana Trade Union Council,  
H.No.- 5-295, Indra Nagar,  
Opp. Bus Stand, Mancherial,  
Adilabad Dist. - 504208 .....Petitioner

#### **AND**

The General Manager,  
M/s. Singareni Collieries Company Limited,  
Bellampalli Area, Goleti Township,  
Adilabad Distt.-504292 ....Respondent

#### **APPEARANCES:**

For the Petitioner : Nil  
For the Respondent : M/s. P.A.V.V.S. Sarma & Vijaya Lakhsmi Panguluri, Advocates

#### **AWARD**

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. L-22012/209/2012-IR(CM-II) dated 4.12.2012 referred the following dispute between the management of M/s. Singareni Collieries Company Ltd., and their workman under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 for adjudication to this Tribunal. The reference is,

#### **SCHEDULE**

Whether the action of the Chief General Manager, M/s. Singareni Collieries Company Ltd., Bellampalli Area, Goleti Township, Adilabad District in disempanelling Shri Gattu Ramaiah, Ex-

Badli Coal Filler, Goleti-1 Inc., SCCL, Bellampally Area with effect from 14.5.2004 is justified or not? To what relief the applicant is entitled for?"

The reference is numbered in this Tribunal as I.D. No. 21/2013 and notices were issued to the parties.

2. The case stands posted for filling of claim statement and documents.

3. Petitioner called absent and there is no representation. Claim statement not filed. Inspite of giving fair opportunity again and again Petitioner is not taking interest in the proceedings and is not making any claim. In the circumstances, taking that there is no claim to be made, 'Nil' award is passed.

Award passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. P. Phani Gowri, Personal Assistant, corrected by me on this the 19th day of March, 2014.

M. VIJAYA LAKSHMI, Presiding Officer

#### **Appendix of evidence**

Witnesses examined for the Petitioner	Witnesses examined for the Respondent
---------------------------------------	---------------------------------------

NIL

NIL

#### **Documents marked for the Petitioner**

NIL

#### **Documents marked for the Respondent**

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 22 अप्रैल, 2014

**का०आ०. 1314.—ऑद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार एस० सी० सी० एल० के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट ऑद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 29/2013) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 22/04/2014 को प्राप्त हुआ था।**

[सं० एल-22012/240/2012-आईआर (सी एम-II) ]

बी. एम. पटनायक, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 22nd April, 2014

**S.O. 1314.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 29/2013) of the Cent. Govt. Indus. Tribunal-cum-Labour**

Court, Hyderabad as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of M/s Singareni Collieries Co. Limited, and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 22/04/2014.

[No. L-22012/240/2012-IR(CM-II)]

B.M. PATNAIK, Desk Officer

#### **ANNEXURE**

#### **BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD**

**PRESENT:** SMT. M. VIJAYA LAKSHMI, Presiding Officer

Dated the 1st day of January, 2014

#### **INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. I.D. 29/2013**

#### **BETWEEN:**

The President,

(Sri Bandari Satyanarayana)

Telangana Trade Union Council,

H. No.- 5-295, Indra Nagar,

Opp. Bus Stand, Mancherial,

Adilabad Dist. - 504208 ..... Petitioner

#### **AND**

The General Manager,

M/s. Singareni Collieries Company Limited,

Mandamarri Area,

Mandamarri - 504 231

.....Respondent

#### **APPEARANCES:**

For the Petitioner : Nil

For the Respondent : M/s. P. A. V. V. S. Sarma & Vijaya Lakshmi Panguluri, Advocates

#### **AWARD**

"The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. L-22012/240/2012-IR(CM-II) dated 11.2.2013 referred the following dispute between the management of M/s. Singareni Collieries Company Ltd., and their workman under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 for adjudication to this Tribunal. The reference is,

**SCHEDULE**

“Whether the action of the management of General Manager of M/s. Singareni Collieries Company Ltd., Mandamarri Area, Mandamarri Adilabad District in terminating the service of Sri Bhoopelli Sagar, Ex-Coal Filler, KK-1 Inc., SCCL, Mandamarri Area with effect from 20.8.1999 is justified or not? If not, to what relief the applicant is entitled for?”

The reference is numbered is this Tribunal as I.D. No. 29/2013 and notices were issued to the parties.

2. The case stands posted for filing of claim statement and documents.

3. Petitioner called absent and there is no representation. Inspite of giving notice time and again Petitioner is not appearing and taking interest in the proceedings. In the circumstances, taking that Petitioner got no claim to be made, 'Nil' award is passed.

Award passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. P. Phani Gowri, Personal Assistant, corrected by me on this the 1st day of January, 2014.

M. VIJAYA LAKSHMI, Presiding Officer

**Appendix of evidence**

Witnesses examined for the Petitioner	Witnesses examined for the Respondent
NIL	NIL

**Documents marked for the Petitioner**

NIL

**Documents marked for the Petitioner**

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 22 अप्रैल, 2014

का०आ०.1315.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947, (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एस०सी०सी०एल० के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध 1 में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण /श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 30/2013) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 22.04.2014 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं० एल-22012/241/2012-आईआर (सीएम-II)]

बी० एम० पटनायक, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 22nd April, 2014

**S.O. 1315.**—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central

Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 30/2013) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Hyderabad as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial Dispute between the management of M/s Singareni Collieries Co. Limited, and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 22.04.2014.

[No. L-22012/241/2012-IR(CM-II)]

B.M. PATNAIK, Desk Officer

**ANNEXURE**

**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT  
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT AT  
HYDERABAD**

**PRESENT:** SMT. M. VIJAYA LAKSHMI, Presiding Officer

Dated the 1st day of January, 2014

**INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. I. D. 30/2013**

**BETWEEN:**

The President,

(Sri Bandari Satyanarayana)

Telangana Trade Union Council,

H.No.- 5-295, Indra Nagar,

Opp. Bus Stand, Mancherial,

Adilabad Dist. - 504208

..... Petitioner

**AND**

The General Manager,

M/s. Singareni Collieries Company Limited,

Mandamarri Area,

Mandamarri- 504 231

Anilabad Distt.

..... Respondent

**APPEARANCES:**

For the Petitioner : NIL

For the Respondent : M/s. P.A.V.V.S Sarma & Vijaya Lakshmi Panguluri, Advocates

**AWARD**

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. L-22012/241/2012-IR (CM-II) dated 11.2.2013 referred the following dispute between the management of M/s. Singareni Collieries Company Ltd., and their workman under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 for adjudication to this Tribunal. The referene is,

### SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the Chief General Manager of M/s. Singareni Collieries Company Ltd., Mandamarri Area, Mandamarri, Adilabad District in terminating the services of Sri Gogu Lingaiah, Ex-Coal Filler, MK-4 Inc., SCCL, Mandamarri Area with effect from 29.1.1998 is justified or not? If not, to what relief the applicant is entitled for?"

The reference is numbered in this Tribunal as I.D. No. 30/2013 and notices were issued to the parties.

2. The case stands posted for filing of claim statement and documents.

3. Petitioner called absent and there is no representation. Inspite of giving notice time and again Petitioner is not appearing and taking interest in the proceedings. In the circumstances, taking the Petitioner got no claim to be made, 'Nil' award is passed.

Award passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. P. Phani Gowri, Personal Assistant, corrected by me on this the 1st day of January, 2014.

M. VIJAYA LAKSHMI, Presiding Officer

### Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the Witnesses examined for the

Petitioner	Respondent
NIL	NIL

### Documents marked for the Petitioner

NIL

### Documents marked for the Respondent

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 22 अप्रैल, 2014

**का०आ० 1316.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एस०सी०एल० के प्रबंधतात्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध 1 में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय हैदराबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 31/2013) प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 22/04/2014 को प्राप्त हुआ था।**

[सं० एल-22012/242/2012-आईआर (सीएम-II)]

बी०एम० पटनायक, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 22nd April, 2014

**S.O. 1316.—n** pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No.

31/2013) of the Cent. Govt. Indus. Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Hyderabad as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial dispute between the management of M/s. Singareni Collieries Co. Limited, and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 22/04/2014.

[No. L-22012/242/2012-IR(CM-II)]  
B.M. PATNAIK, Desk Officer

### ANNEXURE

### BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD

**PRESENT:** SMT. M. VIJAYA LAKSHMI,  
Presiding Officer

Dated the 1st day of January, 2014

**INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. I.D. 31/2013**

### BETWEEN:

The President,  
(Sri Bandari Satyanarayana)  
Telangana Trade Union Council,  
H. No.- 5-295, Indra Nagar,  
Opp. Bus Stand, Mancherial,  
Adilabad Dist. - 504208 ..... Petitioner

### AND

The General Manager,  
M/s. Singareni Collieries Company Limited,  
Mandamarri Area, Mandamarri-504 231  
Adilabad Distt. ....Respondent

### APPEARANCES:

For the Petitioner : NIL

For the Respondent : NIL

### AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. L-22012/242/2012-IR(CM-II) dated 11.2.2013 referred the following dispute between the management of M/s. Singareni Collieries Company Ltd., and their workman under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 for adjudication to this Tribunal. The reference is,

### SCHEDULE

“Whether the action of the management of General Manager of M/s. Singareni Collieries Company Ltd., Mandamarri Area, Mandamarri, Adilabad

District in terminating the services of Sri Kotte Jayakar, Ex-Coal Filler, KK-5 Inc., SCCL, Mandamarri Area with effect from 30.7.2001 is justified or not? If not, to what relief the applicant is entitled for?"

The reference is numbered in this Tribunal as I.D. 31/2013 and notices were issued to the parties.

2. The case stands posted for filing of claim statement and documents.

3. Petitioner called absent and there is no representation. Inspite of giving notice time and again Petitioner is not appearing and taking interest in the proceedings. In the circumstances, taking that Petitioner got no claim to be made, 'Nil' award is passed.

Award passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. P. Phani Gowri, Personal Assistant, corrected by me on this the 1st day of January, 2014.

M. VIJAYA LAKSHMI, Presiding Officer

#### **Appendix of evidence**

Witnesses examined for the Petitioner      Witnesses examined for the Respondent

NIL      NIL

#### **Documents marked for the Petitioner**

NIL

#### **Documents marked for the Respondent**

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 22 अप्रैल, 2014

का०आ० 1317.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एस० सी० सी० एल० के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 32/2013) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 22/04/2014 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं० एल-22012/243/2012-आई आर (सी एम-II)]  
बी०एम० पटनायक डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 22nd April, 2014

S.O. 1317.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central

Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. 32/2013) of the Cent.Govt.Indus.Tribunal-Cum-Labour Court, Hyderabad as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of M/s Singareni Collieries Co. Limited, and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 22/04/2014.

[No. L-22012/243/2012-IR (CM-II)]

B.M. PATNAIK, Desk Officer

#### **ANNEXURE**

#### **BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD**

**PRESENT:** SMT. M. VIJAYA LAKSHMI, Presiding Officer

Dated the 1st day of January, 2014

#### **INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. I. D. 32/2013**

#### **BETWEEN:**

The President,

(Sri Bandari Satyanarayana)

Telangana Trade Union Council,

H.No.- 5-295, Indra Nagar,

Opp. Bus Stand, Mancherial,

Adilabad Dist. - 504208

.....Petitioner

#### **AND**

The General Manager,

M/s. Singareni Collieries Company Limited,

Mandamarri Area,

Mandamarri-504 231

Adilabad Distt.

....Respondent

#### **APPEARANCES:**

For the Petitioner : NIL

For the Respondent : M/S.P.A.V.V.S. Sarma & Vijaya Lakshmi Panguluri, Advocates

#### **AWARD**

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. L-22012/243/2012-IR (CM-II) dated 19.2.2013 referred the following dispute between the management of M/s. Singareni Collieries Company Ltd., and their workman under section 10(1) (d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 for adjudication to this Tribunal. The reference is,

#### **SCHEDULE**

"Whether the action the management of General Manager of M/s. Singareni Collieries Company Ltd., Mandamarri Area, Mandamarri, Adilabad

District in Terminating the services of Shri Ratnam Ramaswamy, Ex-Badli Coal Filler, KK-5A Inc., SCCL, Mandamarri Area with effect from 5.3.2003 is justified or not? If not, to what relief the applicant is entitled for?"

The reference is numbered in this Tribunal as I.D. No. 32/2013 and notices were issued to the parties.

2. The Case stands posted for filing of claim statement and documents.

3. Petitioner called absent and there is no representation. Inspite of giving notice time and again Petitioner is not appearing and taking interest in the Proceedings. In the circumstances, taking the Petitioner got no claim to be made, 'Nil' award is passed.

Award passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. P. Phani Gowri, Personal Assistant, corrected by me on this the 1st day of January, 2014.

M. VIJAYA LAKSHMI, Presiding Officer

#### **Appendix of evidence**

Witnesses examined for the Petitioner	Witnesses examined for the Respondent
NIL	NIL

#### **Documents Marked for the Petitioner**

NIL

#### **Documents marked for the Respondent**

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 22 अप्रैल, 2014

का०आ० 1318.—ओद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार एस०सी०सी०एल० के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबंध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट ओद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार ओद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 33/2013) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 22/04/2014 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं० एल०-22012/245/2012-आईआर (सीएम-II)]

बी०एम० पटनायक, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 22nd April, 2014

**S.O. 1318.**—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 33/2013) of the Central Govt. Indus. Tribunal-cum Labour

Court, Hyderabad as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of M/s Singareni Collieries Co. Limited, and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 22/04/2014.

[No. L-22012/245/2012-IR(CM-II)]

B. M. PATNAIK, Desk Officer.

#### **ANNEXURE**

#### **BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD**

**PRESENT:** SMT. M. VIJAYA LAKSHMI, Presiding Officer

Dated the 1st day of January, 2014

#### **INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE NO. I.D. 33/2013**

#### **BETWEEN:**

The President,  
(Sri Bandari Satyanarayana)  
Telangana Trade Union Council,  
H.No.- 5-295, Indra Nagar,  
Opp. Bus Stand, Mancherial,  
Adilabad Dist. - 504208 ... Petitioner

#### **AND**

The General Manager,  
M/s. Singareni Collieries Company Limited,  
Mandamarri Area,  
Mandamarri-504 231  
Adilabad Distt. ... Respondent

#### **APPEARANCES:**

For the Petitioner : NIL

For the Respondent : M/S. P.A. V.V.S. Sarma & Vijaya Lakshmi Panguluri, Advocates

#### **AWARD**

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. L-22012/245/2012-IR(CM-II) dated 19.2.2013 referred the following dispute between the management of M/s. Singareni Collieries Company Ltd., and their workman under section 10 (1) (d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 for adjudication to this Tribunal. The reference is,

#### **SCHEDULE**

"Whether the action the management of General Manager of M/s. Singareni Collieries Company

Ltd., Mandamarri Area, Mandamarri, Adilabad District in terminating the services of Sri Thungapindi Balaiah, Ex-Coal Filler, MK-4 Inc., SCCL, Mandamarri Area with effect from 19.2.2003 is justified or not? If not, to what relief the applicant is entitled for?"

The reference is numbered in this Tribunal as I.D. No. 33/2013 and notices were issued to the parties.

2. The case stands posted for filling of claim statement and documents.

3. Petitioner called absent and there is no representation. In spite of giving notice time and again Petitioner is not appearing and taking interest in the proceedings. In the circumstances, taking that Petitioner got no claim to be made, 'Nil' award is passed.

Award passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. P. Phani Gowri, Personal Assistant, corrected by me on this the 1st day of January, 2014.

M. VIJAYA LAKSHMI, Presiding Officer

#### **Appendix of evidence**

Witnesses examined for the Petitioner	Witnesses examined for the Respondent
NIL	NIL

#### **Documents Marked for the Petitioner**

NIL

#### **Documents marked for the Respondent**

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 22 अप्रैल, 2014

**का०आ० 1319.—ऑद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एस०सी०सी०एल० के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध 1 में निर्दिष्ट ऑद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार ऑद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 60/2012) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 22/04/2014 को प्राप्त हुआ था।**

[सं० एल-22012/117/2012-आई आर (सीएम-II)]

बी०एम० पटनायक, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 22nd April, 2014

**S.O.1319.—**In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No.60/2012)

of the Cent. Govt. Indus. Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Hyderabad as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial dispute between the management of M/s. Singareni Collieries Co. Limited, and their workman, received by the Central Government on 22/04/2014.

[No. L-22012/117/2012-IR(CM-II)]

B.M. PATNAIK, Desk Officer

#### **ANNEXURE**

#### **BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD**

**PRESENT:** SMT. M. VIJAYA LAKSHMI, Presiding Officer

Dated the 1st day of January, 2014

#### **INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. I. D. 60/2012**

#### **BETWEEN:**

The President, (Sri Bandari Satyanarayana)	
Telangana Trade Union Council, H.No.- 5-295, Indra Nagar,	
Opp. Bus Stand, Mancherial, Adilabad Dist. - 504208	... Petitioner

#### **AND**

The General Manager, M/s. Singareni Collieries Company Limited, Bellampalli Area, Goleti Township, Adilabad Distt. Andhra Pradesh	... Respondent
---	----------------

#### **APPEARANCE:**

For the Petitioner : NIL	
For the Respondent : M/s. P.A.V.V.S. Sarma & Vijaya Lakshmi Panguluri, Advocates	

#### **AWARD**

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. L-22012/117/2012-1R(CM-II) dated 26.9.2012 referred the following dispute between the management of M/s. Singareni Collieries Company Ltd., and their workman under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 for adjudication to this Tribunal. The reference is,

#### **SCHEDULE**

"Whether the action the management of the Chief General Manager of M/s. Singareni Collieries Company Ltd., Bellampalli Area, Goleti Township,

Adilabad District in terminating the services of Sri Akkappa Laxminarayana, Ex-Badli, Filler, MVK-6 Inc., Bellampalli Area with effect from 22.5.2001 is justified or not? To what relief the applicant is entitled for?"

The reference is numbered in this Tribunal as I.D. No. 60/2012 and notices were issued to the parties.

2. The case stands posted for filing of claim statement and documents.

3. Petitioner called absent and there is no representation. In spite of giving notice time and again Petitioner is not appearing and taking interest in the proceedings. In the circumstances, taking that Petitioner got no claim to be made, 'Nil' award is passed.

Award passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. P. Phani Gowri, Personal Assistant, corrected by me on this the 1st day of January, 2014.

M. VIJAYA LAKSHMI, Presiding Officer

#### **Appendix of evidence**

Witnesses examined for the Petitioner	Witnesses examined for the Respondent
NIL	NIL

#### **Documents Marked for the Petitioner**

NIL

#### **Documents marked for the Respondent**

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 22 अप्रैल, 2014

का०आ० 1320.—ओद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एस० सी० सी० एल० के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट ओद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार ओद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 69/2013) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 22/04/2014 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं० एल-22012/62/2013-आई आर (सी० एम०-II)]

बी०एम० पटनायक, डेस्क अधिकारी,

New Delhi, the 22nd April, 2014

**S.O. 1320.**—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central

Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. 69/2013) of the Cent. Govt. Indus. Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Hyderabad as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of M/s. Singareni Collieries Co. Ltd., and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 22/04/2014.

[L-No. 22012/62/2013-IR (CM-II)]

B.M. PATNAIK, Desk Officer.

#### **ANNEXURE**

#### **BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD**

**PRESENT:** SMT. M. VIJAYA LAKSHMI, Presiding Officer

Dated the 30th day of January, 2014

#### **INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. I.D. 69/2013**

#### **BETWEEN:**

The President, (Sri Bandari Satyanarayana)	
Telangana Trade Union Council, H.No.- 5-295, Indra Nagar, Opp. Bus Stand, Mancherial, Adilabad Dist. - 504208	.... Petitioner

#### **AND**

The General Manager, M/s. Singareni Collieries Company Limited, Bellampalli Area, Goleti Township (P.O.) Adilabad Dist.-504292.	.... Respondent
--	-----------------

#### **APPEARANCE:**

For the Petitioner : NIL	
For the Respondent : M/S. P.A.V.V.S. Sarma & V.S.V. S.R. K.S. Prasad, Advocates	

#### **AWARD**

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. L-22012/62/2013-IR(CM-II) dated 8.7.2013 referred the following dispute between the management of M/s. Singareni Collieries Company Ltd., and their workman under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 for adjudication to this Tribunal. The reference is,

#### **SCHEDULE**

“Whether the action the management of General Manager of M/s. Singareni Collieries Company Ltd.,

Bellampalli Area, Goleti Township (P.O.), Adilabad Distt., in terminating the services of Sri Dubbaka Govinda Raju, Ex-Badli Filler, Goleti-2 Inc., SCCo. Ltd., Bellampalli Area with effect from 28.8.1993 is justified or not? If not, to what relief the applicant is entitled for?"

The reference is numbered in this Tribunal as I.D. No. 69/2013 and notices were issued to the parties.

2. The case stands posted for filing of claim statement and documents.

3. Petitioner called absent and there is no representation. Inspite of receiving notice twice, Petitioner is not appearing and taking interest in the proceedings. In the circumstances, taking that Petitioner got no claim to be made, 'Nil' award is passed.

Award passed accodingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. P. Phani Gowri, Personal Assistant, corrected by me on this the 30th day of January, 2014.

M. VIJAYA LAKSHMI, Presiding Officer

#### **Appendix of evidence**

Witnesses examined for the Petitioner	Witnesses examined for the Respondent
NIL	NIL

#### **Documents Marked for the Petitioner**

NIL

#### **Documents marked for the Respondent**

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 22 अप्रैल, 2014

का०आ० 1321.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एस०सी०सी०एल० के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 71/2013) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 22/04/2014 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं० एल-22012/63/2013-आई आर (सी एम-II)]

बी.एम. पटनायक, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 22nd April, 2014

S.O. 1321.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central

Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No.71/2013) of the Cent. Govt. Indus.Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Hyderabad as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of M/s. Singareni Collieries Co. Ltd., and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 22/04/2014.

[No. L-22012/63/2013-IR (CM-II)]

B.M. PATNAIK, Desk Officer

#### **ANNEXURE**

#### **BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD**

**PRESENTS:** SMT. M. VIJAYA LAKSHMI, Presiding Officer

Dated the 30th day of January, 2014

#### **INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE NO. I.D. 71/2013**

#### **BETWEEN:**

The President,

(Sri Bandari Satyanarayana)

Telangana Trade Union Council,

H. No.- 5-295, Indra Nagar,

Opp. Bus Stand, Mancherial,

Adilabad Dist. - 504208

.... Petitioner

#### **AND**

The General Manager,

M/s. Singareni Collieries Company Limited,

Bellampalli Area, Goleti Township, (P.O.)

Adilabad Distt.-504292

...Respondent

#### **APPEARANCES:**

For the Petitioner : Nil

For the Respondent : M/s P.A. V.V.S. Sarma & V.S.R. S.R. K.S. Prasad, Advocates

#### **AWARD**

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. L-22012/63/2013-IR(CM-II) dated 5.7. 2013 referred the following dispute between the management of M/s Singareni Collieries Company Ltd., and their workman under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 for adjudication to this Tribunal. The reference is,

### SCHEDULE

“Whether the action the management of General Manager of M/s. Singareni Collieries Company Ltd., Bellampalli Area, Goleti Township (P.O.). Adilabad Distt., in terminating the services of Sri Daki Mallaiah, Ex-Coal Filler, MVK-5, Inc. SCCo. Ltd., Bellampalli Area with effect from 23.5.2001 is justified or not? If not, to what relief the applicant is entitled for?”

The reference is numbered in this Tribunal as I.D. No. 71/2013 and notices were issued to the parties.

2. The case stands posted for filing of claim statement and documents.

3. Petitioner called absent and there is no representation. Inspite of receiving notice twice, Petitioner is not appearing and taking interest in the proceedings. In the circumstances, taking that Petitioner got no claim to be made. ‘Nil’ award is passed.

Award passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. P. Phani Gowri, Personal Assistant, corrected by me on this the 30th day of January, 2014.

M. VIJAYA LAKSHMI, Presiding Officer

### Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the Petitioner	Witnesses examined for the Respondent
NIL	NIL

### Documents Marked for the Petitioner

NIL

### Documents marked for the Respondent

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 22 अप्रैल, 2014

का०आ० 1322.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एस०सी०एल० के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध 1 में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/अमन्यायालय, हैदराबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 72/2013) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 22/04/2014 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं० एल-22012/48/2013-आईआर (सी.एम.-II)]

बी. एम. पटनायक, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 22nd April, 2014

**S.O.1322.**—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central

Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 72/2013) of the Cent. Govt. Indus. Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Hyderabad as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the management of M/s. Singareni Collieries Co. Limited, and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 22/04/2014.

[No. L-22012/48/2013-IR(CM-II)]

B.M. PATNAIK, Desk Officer

### ANNEXURE

#### BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD

**PRESENT:** SMT. M. VIJAYA LAKSHMI, Presiding Officer

Dated the 30th day of March, 2014

#### INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE NO. I.D. 72/2013

#### BETWEEN:

The President, (Sri Bandari Satyanarayana)	Telangana Trade Union Council, H. No.- 5-295, Indra Nagar, Opp. Bus Stand, Mancherial, Adilabad Dist. - 504208	... Petitioner
---	---	----------------

#### AND

The General Manager, M/s. Singareni Collieries Company Limited, Ramagundam-I Area, Godavarikhani Karimnagar Distt.-505209.	...Respondent
---	---------------

#### APPEARANCES:

For the Petitioner : NIL
For the Respondent : M/s P.A.V.V.S. Sarma & Vijaya Lakhsmi Panguluri, Advocates

#### AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. L-22012/48/2013-1R(CM-II) dated 8.7.2013 referred the following dispute between the management of M/s. Singareni Collieries Company Ltd., and their workman under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 for adjudication to this Tribunal. The reference is,

**SCHEDULE**

"Whether the action the management of General Manager of M/s. Singareni Collieries Company Ltd., Ramagundam-I Area, Godavarikhani, Karimnagar Distt., in terminating the services of Sri Manda Rajamouli, Ex-CF, GDK-6B Inc., SCCo. Ltd., Ramagundam-I Area, Godavarikhani with effect from 31.3.2004 is justified or not? If not, to what relief the applicant is entitled for?"

The reference is numbered in this Tribunal as I.D. 72/2013 and notices were issued to the parties.

2. The case stands posted for filing of claim statement and documents.

3. Petitioner called absent and there is no representation. Inspite of receiving notice twice Petitioner is not appearing and taking interest in the proceedings. In the circumstances, taking that Petitioner got no claim to be made, 'Nil' award is passed.

Award passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. P. Phani Gowri, Personal Assistant, corrected by me on this the 30th day of January, 2014.

M. VIJAYA LAKSHMI, Presiding Officer

**Appendix of evidence**

Witnesses examined for the Petitioner	Witnesses examined for the Respondent
NIL	NIL

**Documents Marked for the Petitioner**

NIL

**Documents marked for the Respondent**

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 22 अप्रैल, 2014

**कांग्रेस 1323.—ऑद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एस०सी०सी०एल० के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट ऑद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 74/2013) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 22/04/2014 को प्राप्त हुआ था।**

[सं एल-22012/81/2013-आईआर(सीएम-II)]  
बी. एम. पटनायक, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 22nd April, 2014

**S.O.1323.—**In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 74/2013) of the Cent. Govt. Indus. Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Hyderabad as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of M/s. Singareni Collieries Co. Ltd., and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 22/04/2014.

[No. L-22012/81/2013-IR(CM-II)]

B.M.PATNAIK, Desk Officer

**ANNEXURE**

**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT  
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT  
AT HYDERABAD**

**PRESENT:** Smt. M. VIJAYA LAKSHMI, Presiding Officer

Dated the 30th day of January, 2014

**INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE NO. I.D. 74/2013**

**BETWEEN:**

The President,  
(Sri Bandari Satyanarayana)  
Telangana Trade Union Council,  
H. No.- 5-295, Indra Nagar,  
Opp. Bus Stand, Mancherial,  
Adilabad Distt. - 504208 ..... Petitioner

**AND**

The General Manager,  
M/s. Singareni Collieries Company Limited,  
Bellampalli Area, Goleti Township, (P.O.)  
Adilabad Distt.-504292 ..... Respondent

**APPEARANCES:**

For the Petitioner :	NIL
For the Respondent :	M/s P.A.V.V.S. Sarma & Vijaya Lakhsmi Panguluri, Advocates

**AWARD**

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. L-22012/81/2013-IR(CM-II) dated 8.7.2013 referred the following dispute between the management of M/s. Singareni Collieries Company Ltd., and their workman under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 for adjudication to this Tribunal. The reference is,

**SCHEDULE**

"Whether the action the management of General Manager of M/s. Singareni Collieries Company Ltd., Bellampalli Area, Goleti Township (P.O.), Adilabad Distt., in terminating the services of Sri Visakha Bhimaiah, Ex-Coal Filler, Goleti-I Inc., SCCo Ltd., Bellampalli, Area with effect from 23.8.2000 is justified or not? If not, to what relief the applicant is entitled for?"

The reference is numbered in this Tribunal as I.D. No. 74/2013 and notices were issued to the parties.

2. The case stands posted for filing of claim statement and documents.

3. Petitioner called absent and there is no representation. Inspite of receiving notice twice, Petitioner is not appearing and taking interest in the proceedings. In the circumstances, taking that Petitioner got no claim to be made, "Nil" award is passed.

Award passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. P. Phani Gowri, Personal Assistant, corrected by me on this the 30th day of January, 2014.

M. VIJAYA LAKSHMI, Presiding Officer

**Appendix of evidence**

Witnesses examined for the Petitioner	Witnesses examined for the Respondent
NIL	NIL

**Documents Marked for the Petitioner**

NIL

**Documents marked for the Respondent**

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 22 अप्रैल, 2014

**का०आ०.1324.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 ( 1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एस०सी०सी०एल० के प्रबंधनतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 73/2002) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 22/04/2014 को प्राप्त हुआ था।**

[सं. एल-22013/1/2014-आईआर (सीएम-II)]  
बी. एम. पटनायक, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 22nd April, 2014

**S.O. 1324.**—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial (Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award Ref. 73/2002 of the Cent.Govt.Indus.Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Hyderabad as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of M/s. Singareni Collieries Co. Ltd., and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 22/04/2014.

[No. L-22013/1/2014-IR(CM-II)]  
B.M. PATNAIK, Desk Officer

**ANNEXURE**

**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT  
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT  
AT HYDERABAD**

**PRESENT:** Smt. M. VIJAYA LAKSHMI, Presiding Officer

Dated the 13th day of February, 2014

**INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE NO. I.D. 73/2002**

**BETWEEN:**

Sri Banoth Lakhya,  
S/o Ravilya,  
C/o Sri K. Vasudeva Reddy,  
4-5-592, Near Badichowdi,  
Vegetable Market, Kutbiguda,  
Hyderabad-27. ....Petitioner

**AND**

1. The General Manager, (Projects),  
M/s. Singareni Collieries Company Limited,  
Yellandu Area, Khammam District.
2. The Superintendent of Mines,  
M/s. Singareni Collieries Company Limited,  
21-Incl., Yellandu Area, Khammam  
District ....Respondents

**APPEARANCES:**

For the Petitioner : M/s. K. Vasudeva Reddy and  
V. Sreramulu, Advocates

For the Respondent : M/s. P.A.V.V.S. Sarma and  
Vijaya Lakhsmi Panguluri,  
Advocates

**AWARD**

Sri Banoth Lakhya, the workman has filed this petition invoking Sec. 2A(2) of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 seeking for setting aside the impugned officer order

No. YCP 27/1923 dated 27.6.2001 issued by the 1st Respondent consequently directing the Respondents to reinstate the Petitioner duly granting all other consequential benefits.

**2. The Averments made in the petition in brief are as follows:**

Petitioner was appointed in the Respondent company in 1983 and his services were regularised and he was designated as general mazdoor. He was regular and attentive to his service upto 1997. Thereafter owing to some family troubles Petitioner suffered chronic Schizophrenia a mental disease. During the year 2000 he did not attend for duties due to the said problem. Though he used to be present in the mine premises being in a mentally disturbed state, used to roam here and there aimlessly. He mental imbalanced health is a fact known to the workers and the Management. He was referred to the institute of mentally handicapped, Hyderabad on 14.12.2000 by the authorities of the 1st Respondent company. He was under continuous treatment till 22.4.2001. Thereafter he was referred to the 1st Respondent company's main hospital, Kothagudem for examination by a psychiatrist. After examining him there the medical authorities referred him to the Government Mental Hospital, Hyderabad during the month of May, 2001. After he was treated in the said hospital, he became normal. At one point of time proposals were mooted, to declare the Petitioner as unfit but keeping those proposals pending a chargesheet dated 23.1.2002 was issued alleging absenteeism without leave or without sufficient cause from 1.1.2000 to 31.12.2000. Basing on the above charge sheet an enquiry seems to have been conducted. It appears that basing on the said chargesheet an enquiry was conducted as the Petitioner was mentally disturbed suffering with chronic Schizophrenia he could not participate in the enquiry effectively. Neither the contents of the chargesheet nor the proceedings of the enquiry have been explained to the Petitioner. Simply his thumb impression was taken. He was not in a position to understand the proceeding. Issuance of chargesheet and conducting of the enquiry proceedings while the Petitioner was suffering from chronic Schizophrenia disease, is nothing but the pre-determined notion of the Respondent to dismiss the Petitioner from services. Basing on the above said enquiry proceedings the impugned order dated 27.6.2001 was issued dismissing the Petitioner from services with effect from 28.6.2001 which is totally illegal and arbitrary. If the enquiry was conducted after Petitioner recovered from the ailment and by giving the opportunity to understand the proceedings to participate in the same and to cross examine the witnesses. The impugned order could have been averted. Taking advantage of the ill-health and

illiteracy and ignorance of procedural aspects, of Petitioner the Management examined irrelevant witnesses, basing on the statement of those witnesses Enquiry Officer has came to perverse conclusion. Petitioner was not supplied with several documents which were relied upon by the Presinting Officer. Before issuing the impugned order approval of competent authority had to be taken but no such approval has been taken. The absenteeism espically due to mental ill-health is not a grave and serious charge. The punishment of dismissal from service can be imposed only in case of grave and serious charges. Thus, such punishment imposed is untenable. The past service of the Petitioner though was not part of the chargesheet was considered during the course of enquiry to arrive at the conclusions. Thus, the findings of the Enquiry Officer are outside the scope of the charges and thus perverse. As the Petitioner has recovered from mental illness he could have been permitted to continue in service instead he was imposed punishment of dismissal from service. Petitioner is the only earning member of the family as the result of the dismissal from service all the members of his family would be put to hardship. Even after the conclusion of the enquiry proceedings apart from the time during the enquiry Petitioner was suffering mental illness. He was referred to Main Hospital, Kothagudem and then the Government Mental Hospital, Hyderabad. Further Petitioner's wife and son have submitted several representations bringing to the notice of the authorities of 1st Respondent about the mental ill-health of the Petitioner. Many news papers also reported about it. Despite of it, enquiry was conducted and Petitioner was removed from service. The same is contrary to the provisions of Standing Orders and circulars issued by the 1st Respondent and illegal and arbitrary. Petitioner rendered sufficient service and he rendered 15 years of service. Hence, the petition.

**3. Respondent filed counter with the averments in brief as follows:**

The contention of the Petitioner that he suffered from chronic Schizophrenia and did not attend his duties during the year 2001 due to the said disease is not correct. His further contention that he was referred to the Institute of Mentally Handicapped on 14.12.2000 by the authorities and he underwent continuous treatment that he was referred to the 1st Respondent's main hospital at Kothagudem and from there to Government Mental Hospital, Hyderabad are also denied. Petitioner is put to strict proof of the same. Petitioner was issued with chargesheet dated 23.1.2001 under the company's Standing Orders No. 25(25) and 25(31) as he remained absent from duty from 1.1.2000 to 31.12.2000. An enquiry was conducted regarding the said charges. Petitioner fully

participated in the said enquiry. Full and fair opportunity was given to him to defend his case. He was explained the procedure in Telugu. Charges were also explained to him. He was asked that he could have help of the defence assistant if any. At every stage proceedings were explained to him in Telugu. After satisfying with the same he affixed his thumb impression in the proceedings sheet. He admitted the charges levelled against him. He stated that he remained absent during this period as he went to temples at Bhadrachalam, Tirupathi and Mumbai. At no point of time he disclosed the alleged ill-health during the course of enquiry held on 26.2.2001. The alleged disease of chronic Schizophrenia was invented by the Petitioner to get over the lapse of long absenteeism from service. The enquiry proceeding together with enquiry report was served on the Petitioner on 15.5.2001 giving an opportunity to represent against the finding of the Enquiry Officer. He has not given any representation. Second show cause notice was issued to him. As there were no extenuating circumstances to take a lenient view Petitioner was dismissed from service with effect from 28.6.2001 vide letter dated 27.6.2001. The attendance of the Petitioner prior to the year 2000 also was not satisfactory. Contention of the Petitioner that he understands that a proposal was noted to declare the Petitioner as unfit for the service is denied. His further contention that due to his illness he could not participate in the enquiry is also denied. He participated in the enquiry and admitted the charges stating that as he has visited the temples of Bhadrachalam, Tirupathi and Mumbai he was absented from duty. He did not produce even an iota of evidence to the prove that he suffered mental illness. Considering the past record of the Petitioner which shows that he was a habitual absentee and since the charges were proved against the Petitioner and he was found guilty the impugned order was passed. The impugned order is not liable to the interfered with. The petition is liable to be dismissed.

4. On 8.9.2003 orders were passed by this forum holding that domestic enquiry was not validly conducted in this case. Ex.M1 to M11 were marked while considering the validity of the domestic enquiry.

5. To substantiate their contentions Management examined MW1 and MW2 and got marked Ex.M1 to M25. Petitioner got examined himself as WW1 to substantiate his contentions and also examined WW2 and WW3 and got marked Ex.W1 to W15.

6. Heard either party.

**7. The Points that arise for determination are:**

1. Whether the impugned termination order dated 27.6.2001 is legal and justified?
2. If not, to what relief the Petitioner is entitled?

**8. Point No. 1:**

It is undisputed fact that Petitioner has not attended to the duties as general mazdoor of the Respondent company during the year 2000. It is the contention of the Management during the domestic enquiry that, he was absent from duties unauthorisedly without sufficient cause

or reason and therefore he violated the Standing Orders No. 25.25 and 25.31 and is liable for punishment for said misconduct.

9. Domestic enquiry was evidently conducted in which Petitioner also participated. But the fact remains that the material on record clearly disclose that at the relevant period of absenteeism as well as domestic enquiry, Petitioner was suffering from mental disability due to chronic Schizophrenia, a serious mental disorder. The oral and documentary evidence adduced on record show that during the year 1999, 2000 and 2001 Petitioner suffered from this ailment. He left his house without knowledge of anybody and his whereabouts were not known for some time. Ex. W1 and W2, the newspaper publications relied upon by the Petitioner and also other evidence available on record substantiates the same.

10. Ex. W3 and Ex. M 15 both are one and the same documents *i.e.*, the referral letter dated 14.12.2000 issued by the Dy. Medical Superintendent, Y.C. Hospital, Yellandu which belong to the Respondent company, whereunder Petitioner has been referred to the Institute of Mentally Handicapped, Hyderabad for further advise and treatment. In this letter the Dy. Medical Superintendent, Y.C. Hospital, Yellandu has clearly stated that Petitioner's case has been a chronic Schizophrenia since two years. It means since two years prior to 14.12.2000, Petitioner has been suffering from chronic Schizophrenia to the knowledge of the Respondent.

11. Ex. W4 is the representation made by the Petitioner's wife on 15.12.2000 to the General Manager of the Respondent company stating about the mental health condition of the Petitioner enclosing Doctor Certificate also.

12. Inspite of all the above referred circumstances, Ex. M1 chargesheet dated 23.1.2001 has been issued against the Petitioner alleging that due to his unauthorized absenteeism during the year 2000 he has committed the misconduct under Respondent's Standing Orders No. 25.25 and 25.31. Thus, it is very much clear that inspite of having knowledge that Petitioner was suffering from mental disorder and due to the same, he was unable to attend to the duties during the year 2000, an enquiry was conducted into the said absenteeism. Further it is very much clear from Ex. M15 that though it is in the knowledge of the Respondent company, that Petitioner was mentally ill from the year 1999 to 2001, during the year 2001 departmental enquiry was conducted against him and claiming that fair opportunity has been given to the Petitioner, during the said enquiry though he was mentally ill during that time, he was found to be guilty of misconduct of unauthorized absence by the Enquiry Officer and to the said effect Ex. M16 enquiry report was given. Acting on the said report and inspite of Ex. M20,

M21 and M22, the proceedings of the hospitals at Yellandu and the Main Hospital Kothagundem whereunder, the mental condition of the Petitioner has been mentioned, the Respondent organization proceeded with awarding punishment of dismissal from service to the Petitioner by virtue of Ex. M2 order dated 27/28.6.2001.

13. Whereas on 31.7.2001 Petitioner has been discharged from the Institute of Mentally Handicapped, Hyderabad. Ex. W13 is the discharge certificate issued on that date, which means upto 31.7.2001 Petitioner's mental condition was not sound.

14. On due consideration of the material on record by virtue of order dated 8.9.2003, domestic enquiry conducted in this case has been held as invalid. There after to substantiate their contentions Management examined MW1 and MW2 and got marked various documents as the evidence of their side which has already been discussed above. The same are proving that to the knowledge of the Management Petitioner was mentally sick during the relevant time covered by the charges in the chargesheet and also during the time of domestic enquiry. MW1 has not disputed with the factum of mental sickness of the Petitioner. The evidence made available on record is clearly showing that Management is aware of the sickness of the Petitioner. Inspite of it they issued chargesheet against the Petitioner, conducted domestic enquiry and also awarded punishment of dismissal from service to him. This is certainly and arbitrary action. The person who is mentally sick can not be made responsible for his action/inaction. The impugned order of dismissal from service which is now being questioned is certainly not maintainable under law for the reason that there was no opportunity for the Petitioner to effectively participate in the enquiry owing to his mental sickness at the relevant time. Further more, the very chargesheet is not maintainable for the reason that to the knowledge of the Management, Petitioner was mentally sick during the period covered by the charges and for that reason only he was unable to attend his duties and therefore his absenteeism from duties is not without cause or reason.

In view of the fore gone discussion, the impugned order is liable to be set aside.

This point is answered accordingly.

#### **15. Point No. II:**

In view of the finding given in Point No. 1, Petitioner is entitled for the relief of reinstatement into service forth with as General Mazdoor. In this context the fact that Petitioner has been re-appointed on 16.9.2005 as badli filler has to be noted. As can be seen from Ex. W14, he was so appointed as badli filler but for a period of one year only. It is a fresh appointment which got

nothing to do with his earlier post held as General Mazdoor. Petitioner is claiming that he is to be reinstated into service as General Mazdoor since for no fault of him and for sufficient cause *i.e.*, his mental illness he was unable to attend his duties and therefore, he is not at all guilty of misconduct of unauthorized absence. There is substance in this contention.

16. Further more, one another important aspect to be considered is whether the Respondent organization is correctly dealt with the Petitioner who was suffering from Mental illness at the relevant time. It is the contention of the Learned Counsel for the Petitioner that Petitioner was a disabled person at the relevant time and he is covered by "The Persons With Disabilities (Equal Opportunities, Protection of Rights and Full Participation) Act, 1995" and thus Sec. 47 of the said Act applies to him. Respondents can not deny the force of this contention. Sec. 2(i) of this Act enumerates the disabilities for the purpose of this Act. Section 2(I)(vii) provides that mental illness is disability. Thus, Petitioner who suffered mental illness is covered by this Act. It is not in dispute that Respondent organization is bound by this Act.

**Therefore, Petitioner is entitled for the benefit of the provisions of Sec. 47 of this Act which reads as follows:**

**"47. Non-discrimination in Government employment :- (1) No establishment shall dispense with, or reduce in rank, an employee who acquires a disability during his service:**

*Provided that, if an employee, after acquiring disability is not suitable for the post he was holding, could be shifted to some other post with the same pay scale and service benefits:*

*Provided further that if it is not possible to adjust the employee against any post, he may be kept on a supernumerary post until a suitable post is available or he attains the age of superannuation, whichever is earlier.*

**(2) No promotion shall be denied to a person merely on the ground of his disability:**

*Provided that the appropriate Government may, having regard to the type of work carried on in any establishment, by notification and subject to such conditions, if any, as may be specified in such notification, exempt any establishment from the provisions this section."*

17. Thus, Petitioner can not be reduced in rank due to the disability suffered by him. He can not be denied any promotion either. It is not the case of the Respondents the Petitioner is not suitable for the work of General Mazdoor or that there is no suitable work for him in their organization. Therefore, after his reinstatement into service as General

Mazdoor he is to be granted all attendant benefits. He is also entitled for back wages for entire period. The amounts paid towards wages to him after his fresh appointment as badli filler are to be deducted from the said back wages payable to him.

This point is answered accordingly.

**Result:**

In the result, petition is allowed. Ex. M2, the impugned termination order dated 27/28.6.2001 dismissing the Petitioner from service, is hereby set aside holding that it is illegal and inoperative. Petitioner shall be reinstated into service as General mazdoor forth with. He shall be paid all back wages payable to General mazdoor and while so, the amounts already paid towards wages to the Petitioner as badli filler appointing him afresh by virtue of Ex. W14 order dated 16.9.2005 shall be deducted. Petitioner is entitled for all other attendant benefits also like promotion etc., if such rights were accrued to him in regular course of employment as attendant benefits.

This point is answered accordingly.

Award passed accordingly. Transmit.

Dictated to Smt. P. Phani Gowri, Personal Assistant transcribed by her corrected by me on this the 13th day of February, 2014.

M. VIJAYA LAKSHMI, Presiding Officer  
Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the Petitioner	WW1: Sri Banoth Lakhya	Witnesses examined for the Respondent
		Rao
WW2: Sri J. Mangaiah		MW1: Sri P. Purushottam
WW3: Sri Banoth Ramesh		MW2: V.V.S.N. Murthy

Documents marked for the Petitioner

- Ex. W1: Photostat copy of the paper clipping dt. 9.10.2000
- Ex. W2: Photostat copy of the paper clipping dt. 16.10.2000
- Ex. W3: Photostat copy of proceeding issued by Dy. Medical Supdt. YC Hospital, Yellandu referring the Petitioner to Instt. of Mentally handicapped, Hyderabad, Dt. 14.12.2000

- Ex. W4: Photostat copy representation on behalf of WW1 dt. 15.12.2000
- Ex. W5: Photostat copy of proceeding of SOM-21 inc. to Dy. MS, YCH, Yellandu, disclosing the mental status of the Petitioner dt. 15.5.2001
- Ex. W6: Photostat copy of proceedings of Dy. MS, YCH to Supdt., Main Hospital, Kothagudem referring the Petitioner to Psychiatric treatment dt. 15.5.2001
- Ex. W7: Photostat copy of Ir. of Supdt., Main Hospital Kothagudem to Dy. MS, YCH, informing that Petitioner is a chronic Seizhophenia patient and to refer him to Govt. Mental Hospital, Hyderabad dt. 22.5.2001
- Ex. W8: Photostat copy of Ir. From Dy. MS, YC Hospital, Yellandu, to the Supdt., Govt. Mental Hospital, Hyderabad referring the Petitioner for treatment of Chronic Seizhophenia dt. 26.5.2001
- Ex. W9: Photostat copy of representation submitted on behalf of the Petitioner dt. 26.5.2001
- Ex. W10: Photostat copy of Proceeding of SOM-21 inc. to the GM (Projects) Yellandu to refer the Petitioner to the Corporate Medical Board dt. 5.6.2001
- Ex. W11: Photostat copy of application purportedly signed by the Petitioner for examination by Corporate Medical Board dt. 5.6.2001
- Ex. W12: Photostat copy of proceeding issued by GM(Projects) Yellandu dismissing the Petitioner from service dt. 27.6.2001
- Ex. W13: Photostat copy of discharge certificate issued by Supdt., Instt. of Medical Health, Hyderabad dt. 31.7.2001
- Ex. W14: Photostat copy of office order issued by GM(Personnel) appointing the Petitioner afresh as badli filler for a period of one year dt. 16.9.2005
- Ex. W15: Photostat copy of office order issued by CGM(Personnel) appointing him afresh as badli filler dt. 20.1.2007

Documents marked for the Respondent

- Ex. M1: Office copy of chargesheet dt. 23.1.2001
- Ex. M2: Office copy of dismissal order dt. 27.6.2001
- Ex. M3 to
- Ex. M14: Photostat copies of pay slips of WW1 from January, 2000 to December, 2000

Ex.M15: Photostat copy of letter dt. 14.12.2000 to the Supdt., Instt. of Mentally Handicapped, Hyderabad from Dy. MS, YC Hospital, Yellandu

Ex.M16: Enquiry report dt. 26.2.2001

Ex.M17: Pay sheets for the year 1998

Ex.M18: Pay sheets for the year 1999

Ex.M19: Representation of the wife of the Petitioner dt. 15.12.2010

Ex.M20: Office copy of the letter of proceedings of Dy. MS, YCH to Supdt., Main Hospital, Kothagudem referring the Petitioner to Psychiatric treatment dt. 15.5.2001

Ex.M21: Photostat copy of Ir. of Supdt., Main Hospital Kothagudem to Dy. MS., YCH, informing that Petitioner is a chronic Seizhophenia patient and to refer him to Govt. Mental Hospital, Hyderabad dt. 22.5.2001

Ex.M22: Office copy of Ir. from Dy. MS, YC Hospital, Yellandu, to the Supdt., Govt. Mental Hospital, Hyderabad referring the Petitioner for treatment of Chronic Seizhophenia dt. 26.5.2001

Ex.M23: Representation submitted on behalf of the Petitioner dt. 26.5.2001

Ex.M24: Photostat copy of proceeding of SOM-21 inc. to the GM(Projects) Yellandu to refer the Petitioner to the Corporate Medical Board dt. 5.6.2001

Ex. M25: Office copy of application purportedly signed by the Petitioner for examination by Corporate Medical Board dt. 5.6.2001.

नई दिल्ली, 22 अप्रैल, 2014

**का०आ० 1325.—**औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार एस०इ०सी०एल० के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय, जबलपुर के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 104/2004) को प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 22/04/2014 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं० एल-22012/403/2003-आई आर (सीएम-II)]  
बी० एम० पटनायक, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 22nd April, 2014

**S.O. 1325.—**In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central

Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 104/2004) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Jabalpur as shown in the Annexure in the industrial dispute between the management of South Eastern Coalfields Ltd. and their workmen, received by the Central Government on 22/04/2014.

[No. L-22012/403/2003-IR(CM-II)]

B. M. PATNAIK, Desk Officer

#### ANNEXURE

#### BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL-TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR

#### NO. CGIT/LC/R/104/2004

PRESIDING OFFICER : SHRI R. B. PATLE

The President,

Rashtriya Koya Khadan Mazdoor Sangh (INTUC),

Branch Churcha Colliery of SECL,

PO Churcha, Distt. Korea (CG),

Korea Chhattisgarh

.....Workman

#### Versus

Chief General Manager,

Baikuntpur Area of SECL,

PO Baikuntpur, Distt. Korea (CG),

Korea Chhattisgarh

...Management

#### AWARD

(Passed on this 21st day of March 2014)

1. As per letter dated 4.10.04 by the Government of India, Ministry of Labour, New Delhi, the reference is received. The reference is made to this Tribunal under Section-10 of I. D. Act, 1947 as per Notification No. L-22012/403/2003-IR (CM-II). The dispute under reference relates to:

"Whether the action of the Chief General Manager, Baikunthpur Area of SECL in not giving notional seniority to Shri R. S. Jaiswal in Clerical Grade-I with retrospective effect from 1.4.86 and in Sr. Clerk with retrospective effect from 1.6.91 and promotion with retrospective effect is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled?"

2. After receiving reference, notices were issued to the parties. Union submitted statement of claim at Page 3/1 to 3/8. Case of Ist Party Union is that the reference relates to promotion to the post of Clerk Grade-I of workman R. S. Jaiswal from 1.4.86. That IIInd Party is an industry has prepared a cadre scheme governing method of promotion of the posts in question. The cadre scheme governing methods of promotion of the posts in question. The cadre

scheme came in force from 17.7.84 under Implementation Instruction No. 34. Clause 3.2 of Cadre Scheme No. 8 pertains to ministerial staff which—selection for the post upto Clerk Grade-I shall be on the basis of seniority-cum-merit and for clerk special grade and above on the basis of merit-cum-seniority, Clause 3.3 of the said cadre scheme provides the Promotional zone for filling the posts upto clerk grade special will be area and post for technical supervisor Grade A will be the company. Ist Party workman further submits that workman R. S. Jaiswal is senior to other workman promoted to the post of Clerical Grade-I *w.e.f.* 1.4.86. Union has prepared a comparative statement of clerical staff of Baikunthpur area of SECL. Its perusal shows that on any post the workman is much senior than the other employees promoted as Clerk Grade-I from 1.4.86. That workman is superseded at the time of promotion of Clerk Grade-I on 1.4.86 though the persons promoted as Clerk Grade-I were also given another promotion of Sr. Clerk Special Grade from 1.6.91. Workman was superseded in the matter of promotion. He was promoted *w.e.f.* 1.1.89 and 1.1.93. It is reiterated that juniors R. P. Sahu and others were promoted superseding the workman. Workman R.S. Jaiswal is superseded. Management has discriminated R. S. Jain, the action of promoting juniors is arbitrary. On such ground, Union prays that workman R. S. Jaiswal be given promotion benefits of Clerk Grade-I in 1.4.86 and Special Grade from 1.6.91.

3. Management filed Written Statement at Page 8/1 to 8/13. IIInd Party submits that as per terms of reference, the promotion of Shri R. S. Jaiswal is claimed retrospectively on 1.4.86 for post of Clerk Grade-I and 1.6.91 for Clerk Special Grade the reference is submitted after long lapse of time of 2 decades. Such reference is not tenable. Workman left over the matter for about 7 years. The Govt. ought to have refused reference on ground of delay. Workman has not disclosed reasons for challenging seniority. Promotion cannot be claimed as a matter of right. Promotion is a managerial function. Promotion depends in various negligence. Claim of workman is not tenable.

4. That SECL is a company registered under Indian Companies Act. It is controlled by General Manager and Board of Chairman-cum-Managing Director. That NCWA contains cadre scheme for purpose of promotional evenue for each category of employees. The Cadre scheme for ministerial staff are given as per Cadre No. I-VIII & annexure VIII-1 to 5. The cadre scheme has been circulated by II of 34 dated 17.7.84. The promotional channel is given under Clause III. Clause III, 3.1 to 3.3 are reproduced. That promotion for the post of Technical Grade B shall be on the basis of seniority-cum-merit and for the post from Technical Grade B to A shall be on the basis of merit-cum seniority, the promotional zone for filling the post upto Clerical Grade Special will be Area and for posts in

Technical and Supervisory Grade A will be area or company as per the prevailing practice in the company. It is reiterated that the promotion for the Clerk Grade-III to I and Grade-I to Special Grade, seniority is maintained Sub Area level and for the post of Sr. Clerk Grade-B to Office Suptd., seniority is maintained at area level that Shri S. N. Singh, O. P. Gupta, R.J. Singh, A. K. Paul and R. P. Sahu were initially appointed on different dates. They were given promotion to post of Clerk Grade-III on different dates in 1978. Mr. R. P. Sahu was promoted to Clerk Grade-II from 11.6.80. Shri S. N. Singh was promoted to Clerk Grade I from 1.4.86, Clerk Grade-B from 1.6.91, O. P. Gupta, Ajay Singh, A. K. Paul were promoted on Clerk Grade-I on 7.5.87. They were promoted to Sr. Clerk post in 1992. Giving details of the promotion on different dates and different area, it is contented that workman cannot claim seniority with those employees. Workman is promoted in post of Suptd. in 2005. Workman is not discriminated in the matter of promotion. He is not superseded therefore workman is not entitled to promotional benefits claimed by him. On such ground, IIInd Party prays for rejection of claim.

5. Considering pleadings on record, the points which arise for my consideration and determination are as under. My findings are recorded against each of them for the reasons as below:—

(i) Whether the action of the Chief General Manager, Baikunthpur Area of SECL in not giving notional seniority to Shri R. S. Jaiswal in Clerical Grade-I with retrospective effect from 1.4.86 and in Sr. Clerk with retrospective effect from 1.6.91 and promotion with retrospective effect is legal and justified?	In Affirmative
(ii) If not, what relief the workman is entitled to?"	Workman is not entitled for any relief.

#### REASONS

6. Union has raised dispute alleging discrimination in the matter of promotion to Shri R. S. Jaiswal that his juniors are promoted. Workman Shri R. S. Jaiswal was superseded. The notional seniority from 1.4.86 for the post of Clerk Grade-I and notional promotion from 1.6.91 for post of Clerk Special Grade. However the Union has failed to participate in reference proceedings, not adduced any evidence. Evidence of Union is closed on 15.10.2012. Management filed affidavit of evidence of its witness Shri Bijay Choudhary. He has supported contentions of management that the seniority upto the post of Clerk

Grade I is maintained at Sub Area Level and promotion is based on seniority cum merit. For the post of Sr. Clerk Grade B to OS, Seniority is maintained at Area Level and promotion is given on basis of merit cum seniority. That Shri R.S. Jaiswal was initially appointed as General Mazdoor *w.e.f.* 1.10.74. He was given promotion time to time. He was promoted to the post of clerk Grade III from 1.1.79. He was promoted to the post of Clerk Grade I *w.e.f.* 1.1.89 and post of Sr. Clerk Grade-B *w.e.f.* 1.1.93. That O.P. Gupta, R.J. Singh, A.K. Paul and R.P. Sahu were initially appointed on different dates on 1975. They were promoted to clerk Cat Grade III *w.e.f.* 1.10.78, they were promoted to the post of Clerk Grade II *w.e.f.* 2.10.79. Shri R.P. Sahu was promoted to the post of Clerk Grade II *w.e.f.* 11.6.80. Shri S.N. Singh was promoted to Clerk Grade I *w.e.f.* 7.5.87. They were further promoted as Sr. Clerk on 31.12.92. Shri R.P. Sahu had submitted representation for notional seniority *w.e.f.* 1.6.86 claiming that he was working in Clerk Grade-II at Kotkona colliery. He was promoted as clerk Grade I on 8.6.89. His colleagues Shri S.N. Singh, O.P. Gupta, R.J. Singh, G.D. Kar and A.K. Paul were promoted earlier to him on 1.4.86 etc. he was given notional promotion. Evidence of management's witness remained unchallenged. The documents are produced by Union Exhibit W-1. Management produced documents Exhibit M-1 to M-3. It is to be noted that Union has not participated in reference proceeding, no evidence is adduced by workman how the workman is superseded or discriminated. In absence of any evidence on part of Union, the demand of Union cannot be accepted. For above reasons, I record my finding in Point No. 1 in Affirmative.

7. In the result, award is passed as under:—

- (1) Action of the Chief General Manager, Baikunthpur Area of SECL in not giving notional seniority to Shri R.S. Jaiswal in Clerical Grade-I with retrospective effect from 1.4.86 and in Sr. Clerk with retrospective effect from 1.6.91 and promotion with retrospective effect is legal and proper.
- (2) Union is not entitled to relief prayed by them.

R.B. PATLE, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 22 अप्रैल, 2014

**कांगड़ा 1326.—ऑद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एस॰ई॰सी॰एल॰ के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट ऑद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, जबलपुर के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 119/92) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 22/04/2014 को प्राप्त हुआ था।**

[सं. एल-22012/46/1992-आई आर (सी-II)]

बी॰एम॰ पटनायक, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 22nd April, 2014

**S.O. 1326.**—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 119/92) of the Cent. Govt. Indus. Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Jabalpur as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of South Eastern Coalfields Ltd., and their workmen, received by the Central Government on 22/04/2014.

[No. L-22012/46/1992-IR (C-II)]

B.M. PATNAIK, Desk Officer

#### ANNEXURE

#### BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR

#### NO. CGIT/LC/R/119/92

PRESIDING OFFICER: SHRI R.B. PATLE

Shri Shyambabu,  
S/o Shri Devnath,  
Ex. Mechanical Helper,  
Grade-II, Jainagar Colliery,  
Gram Bisrampur,  
Distt. Surguja (MP)

...Workman

#### Versus

Sub Area Manager,  
Jainagar Sub Area of SECL,  
PO Bisrampur colliery  
Distt. Surguja (MP)

...Management

#### AWARD

(Passed on this 21st day of March 2014)

1. As per letter dated 18.6.92 by the Government of India, Ministry of Labour, New Delhi, the reference is received. The reference is made to this Tribunal under Section-10 of I.D. Act, 1947 as per Notification No. L-22012/46/92-IR(C-II). The dispute under reference relates to:

"Whether the action of the Sub Area Manager, Jainagar Sub area of Bisrampur Area of SECL, PO Bisrampur Distt. Surguja MP in dismissing Shri Shyam Babu S/o Deonath Cat-II Mech. Helper, Jainagar, 3/4 Incline *w.e.f.* 17.6.91 is legal and justified? If not, to what relief is the concerned workman entitled to?"

2. After receiving reference, notices were issued to the parties. Workman submitted statement of claim at Page 6/1 to 6/12. Case of Ist Party workman is that he was appointed as Mechanical Helper Cat-II at Jainagar Mine No. 3, 4 on 1.2.1981. He was on said post till 17.6.91. That officer below General Manager rank is not competent to

terminate his services. That he was honestly performing his duties for more than 10 years. He was served with chargesheet dated 4.4.91 alleging that he was apprehended carrying 50ft. conveyor belt during night time in area of Jai Nagar Mine No. 3, 4. That he denied the charges against him. That the report about the alleged incident was submitted after 3 days. Chargesheet was also issued to Shri Rangdhar Nayak. It is alleged that workman was falsely implicated because of the dispute with security persons Norbert, Lakanram and Anil Yadav. False report was submitted against him by security personnel. The incident had not occurred, the names of Anil Yadav and Rangdhar Nayak was subsequently added implicating workman. Workman was not caught with bicycle carrying conveyor belt by any of the security personnel. The bicycle and belt was not seized from him. Workman has also pleaded that enquiry was not properly conducted. He was given opportunity to cross-examine witnesses. Enquiry Officer acted as a prosecutor. Principles of natural justice were not followed. The witnesses of management Lakanram and Norbert has stated in their evidence that conveyor belt and bicycle were seized from workman. Seizure Punchnama was not prepared. Joint enquiry held against him and Rangdhar Nayak is illegal. That standing orders are not applicable to the workman. The alleged misconduct is not covered under standing orders Rule 17(1)(a). Workman did not get opportunity for defence. On such ground workman prayed for his reinstatement with consequential benefits.

3. Management filed Written Statement at Page 10/1 to 10/7. IIInd Party submits that SECL is registered under Companies Act. Several coal mines are operated in MP by SECL including Jainagar colliery. Workman was working as mechanical fitter Category-II. Workman was caught red handed. Chargesheet was issued to him. Enquiry was conducted following principles of natural justice. Opportunity for defence to workman was given to him. IIInd Party denies that General Manager has power to terminate/dismiss the workman. IIInd Party submits that in 1981, power of dismissal were also delegated on officers below General Manager. That Bisrampur area was established in 1990 therefore the order of dismissal of workman was passed by Joint Area Manager. That workman was apprehended with stolen material while returning home after IIInd shift on 2.4.1991. Workman was carrying 25 ft. conveyor belt on his bicycle. When he was challenged, the workman left belt at the place and ran away on his bicycle. Chargesheet was issued to workman. The explanation given by workman was not found satisfactory therefore Enquiry Officer was appointed. Joint enquiry was conducted against workman and Rangdhar Nayak as the charges related to same incident. The Enquiry Officer is competent to ask necessary questions. Enquiry is not vitiated only on such grounds. It

is alleged that workman is trying to find fault in enquiry with a motive to take advantage. The enquiry is conducted as per rules. The misconduct alleged against workman is proved. On such ground, IIInd Party prays for rejection of claim.

4. As per order dated 13.12.2010, enquiry conducted against workman is found legal and valid.

5. Considering pleadings on record and findings on Issue No. 1, the points which arise for my consideration and determination are as under. My findings are recorded against each of them for the reasons as below:—

(i) Whether the action of the Sub Area Manager, Jainagar Sub area of Bisrampur Area of SECL, PO Bisrampur Distt. Surguja M P in dismissing Shri Shyam Babu S/o Deonath Cat-II Mech. Helper, Jainagar, 3/4 Incline w.e.f. 17.6.91 is legal and justified?	In Affirmative
(ii) If not, what relief the workman is entitled to?"	Workman is not entitled to relief prayed by him.

#### REASONS

6. In view of enquiry against workman is found legal and proper, question remains for decision whether finding of Enquiry Officer are supported by some evidence or the findings are perverse. Whether the punishment of dismissal imposed against workman is proper and legal. With respect to earlier points, affidavit of evidence is filed by workman. However his affidavit is devoted w.r.t. enquiry conducted against him and Enquiry Officer not allowed workman to cross-examine management's witnesses. As enquiry is already found legal and valid, above part of affidavit of evidence cannot be considered. Workman has then devoted affidavit about statement of management's witnesses Lakanram and Norbert that they have not seen workman carrying belt on bicycle. That bicycle was not seized from workman. The record of Enquiry Proceeding is filed at Exhibit M-1, M-2. Management's witnesses Lakanram and Robert has stated that he was on night duty on 31.3.91. Norbert Lakra was also on duty with him. When they were on search round and reached towards Jainagar Bunkar, he noticed two persons with bicycles when they reached near those persons they found belt was carried on bicycle by those persons. When they stopped those persons and directed them to go towards Jainagar (old) at that time Anil Yadav Security Guard came. It was around 11.30 PM. Anil was on duty at powerhouse. Shri Anil Yadav has taken persons at a distance of about 5 meters and talked with those persons. Then Anil Yadav had told them that they were of his acquaintance and they be released. That they tried to apprehend those persons. Anil said that those persons

cannot run away, they would be called in morning as they were acquainted with him. That he has taken those persons to powerhouse telling the belt would remain safe. Thereafter Anil taken them with him to powerhouse. On next day, Anil was called. The names of those persons were asked from him. He told the names of those persons were Shambabu and Rangdhar. In their cross-examination, evidence of Lakanram and Rangdhar is not shattered. Management witness Norbert in his statement before Enquiry Officer has stated that in the night of 31.3.1981, he and Lakanram were on duty. When they approached towards boundary wall, they had noticed two persons. They had apprehended them. At that time Anil came and he taken those persons to powerhouse. He directed those persons to run away. When they tried to apprehend those persons Anil Yadav said them not to apprehend. He had taken belt to powerhouse saying that the belt would remain safe, they should not worry about it. The evidence of Norbert on above point is not shattered in his cross-examination. Both the witnesses in their cross-examination says that those persons were at 5 metres distance from them. Those persons were walking by boundary side and CHP bridge. Both the witnesses have identified workman before Enquiry Officer as the person found by them in the night. That belt was recovered from Anil Yadav. Norbert was unable to tell distance between his house and house of Shambabu. He was also unable to tell location of house of Rangdhar Nayak. Management's witness P.N. Tiwari corroborated statements of Lakanram and Norbert. In his cross-examination statement of Shri P.N. Tiwari management's witness was not shattered to disbelieve the evidence. Evidence of all management's witnesses is cogent that 1st party workman was found carrying 25 ft. belt on his bicycle. When Lakanram and Norbert, Management's witnesses stopped them, they tried to run away. The evidence on above point is not shattered. The defence of workman was he was falsely implicated. However in cross-examination of management's witnesses Lakanram, Norbert and Tiwari, any kind of enmity is not suggested. I find no reason why all those 3 management witnesses would falsely implicate the workman. The findings of Enquiry Officer holding workman guilty are supported by evidence of Lakanram, Norbert and Tiwari. The findings of Enquiry Officer cannot be said perverse. Therefore I record my finding on Point No. 1 in Affirmative.

7. Point No. 2-charge against workman about theft of conveyor belt is proved from evidence in Enquiry Proceedings. The question arises whether punishment of dismissal imposed on workman is disproportionate or exorbitant and deserves interference. The misconduct proved against workman is of committed theft of belt is serious misconduct. Learned counsel for IIInd Party management Shri A.K. Shashi relies on bunch of citations.

In case of Lalit Popli versus Canara Bank and others reported in 2003(3) Supreme Court Cases 583. Their Lordship dealing with scope of judicial review of High Court under Article 226 High Court does not act as an appellate authority. Their Lordship further observed that approach and objective in criminal proceedings and disciplinary proceedings are altogether distinct and different. In disciplinary proceedings the preliminary question is whether the employee is guilty of such conduct as would merit action against him whereas in criminal proceedings the question is whether the offences registered against him are established and if established what sentence should be imposed upon him. The standard of proof the mode of enquiry and rules governing the enquiry and trial are conceptually different.

In case of State of Tamil Nadu *Versus* Thiru K.V. Perumal and others reported in 1996(5) Supreme Court Cases 474. Their Lordship dealing with service law scope of judicial review. Their Lordship held the question as to whether the charges were established on the material available, held, beyond the scope of judicial review as the Administrative Tribunal is not an appellate authority over the Department Authorities.

The principles laid down cannot be applied to present case as powers are conferred on this Tribunal under Section 11-A of I.D. Act are not identical to the powers of Administrative Tribunal.

Copy of judgment in Writ Petition No. 1108/2002 is submitted. The facts are not comparable of present case. Therefore said judgment cannot be beneficially used in the case.

In case of Prasad Film Laboratories represented by its Director, Madras *Versus* Presiding Officer, Principal Laobur Court, City Civil Court Building Madras and another reported in 2001-LLR-407, in Para 22 of the judgment, their Lordship held the Tribunal discharges its functions in the matter judicially. If the discretion has been properly exercised, this Court would not interfere with such exercise of discretion. The discretionary power to tribunal is not a free licence to direct reinstatement, even when it is not warranted and when the records do not warrant the setting aside the order of dismissal.

In case of Janatha Bazar (South Kanar Central Cooperative Wholesale Stores Ltd.) and others *Versus* Secretary, Sahakari Noukarara Sangha and others reported in 2000(7) Supreme Court Cases 517, their Lordship of the Apex Court dealing with misconduct/penalty held Labour Court cannot substitute the penalty imposed by employer. Discretion of employer exercise in imposing of punishment after misconduct proved the domestic enquiry.

In present case as per finding on Point No. 1, from evidence in Enquiry Proceedings, misconduct of workman is proved. Considering the nature of proved misconduct relating to the theft of belt, I do not find reason to interfere in the punishment. The punishment of dismissal imposed against workman cannot be said excessive or exorbitant. Therefore, I record my finding in Point No. 2 in Affirmative.

8. In the result, award is passed as under:—

- (1) Action of the Sub Area Manager, Jainagar Sub area of Bisrampur Area of SECL, PO Bisrampur Distt. Surguja MP in dismissing Shri Shyam Babu S/o Deonath Cat-II Mech. Helper, Jainagar, 3/4 Incline w.e.f. 17.6.91 is legal and proper.
- (2) Workman is not entitled to any relief.

R. B. PATLE, Presiding Officer.

नई दिल्ली, 22 अप्रैल, 2014

**का०आ० 1327.—ओद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14)** की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एस०इ०सी०एल० के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट ओद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार ओद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, जबलपुर के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 153/91) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 22/04/2014 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं० एल-22012/282/1991-आईआर(सी-II)]  
बी० एम० पटनायक, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 22nd April, 2014

**S.O. 1327.—**In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. 153/91) of the Cent. Govt. Indus. Tribunal-cum-labour Court, Jabalpur as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of South Eastern Coalfields Ltd. and their workmen, received by the Central Government on 22/4/2014.

[No. L-22012/282/1991-IR (C-II)]  
B. M. PATNAIK, Desk Officer

#### ANNEXURE

**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT  
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT,  
JABALPUR**  
**NO. CGIT/LC/R/153/91**  
PRESIDING OFFICER: SHRI R. B. PATLE

Shri Jarnail Singh,  
S/o Shri Uttam Singh,  
Qtr. No. 23/2,  
Churdava Colony,

PO Bankimogra, Distt. Bilaspur ...	Workman
<b>Versus</b>	
Dy. General Manager, SECL, Kusmunda Project, PO Kusmunda Project, Distt. Bilaspur (MP)	... Management

#### AWARD

(Passed on this 10th day of March 2014)

1. As per letter dated 12-9-91 by the Government of India, Ministry of Labour, New Delhi the reference is received. The reference is made to this Tribunal under Section-10 of I.D. Act, 1947 as per Notification No. L-22012(282)/91-IR(C-II). The dispute under reference relates to:

"Whether the action of the management of Kusmunda Project of SECL, Bilaspur justified in terminating the service of Shri Jarnail Singh as Driver (Trainee) w.e.f. 23.12.89? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled?"

2. After receiving reference, notices were issued to the parties. Ist Party workman filed Statement of claim at Page 2/1 to 2/5. The case of Ist Party workman is that he was working in Kusmunda Project of IIInd party as Driver from 1-8-89 to 23-12-89. He was terminated from 22-12-89 by Dy. General Manager on the ground that the certificate of High School submitted by him was found bogus. Workman submits that before termination of his services, his explanation was not called. He was terminated for alleging serious misconduct against him. Show cause notice was not issued to him, no chargesheet was issued by IIInd Party. Enquiry was not conducted against him. His services are terminated illegally. Ist Party workman submits that he had pursued his education from Gurunanak Khalsa School, Orrissa. He passed 10th standard from said school in 1978. Thereafter he was residing at Bilaspur for past 10 years. He had obtained driving licence from Bilaspur prior to January 1991. His licence was renewed on 7-6-94 from RTO, Bilaspur. The allegations against him was imaginary. That for post of Driver passing 10th standard was not required therefore the allegations against him were irrelevant. It is reiterated that he was residing at Bilaspur for more than 12 years as per rules of MP Govt. the persons residing for 3 years was considered to be resident of State. He was driving vehicle since 10 years at Bilaspur. That his services were illegally terminated she had joined membership of the Union. That he joined membership of Central India Trade Union branch Kusmunda. He was terminated in violation of the provisions of standing orders in violation of principles of natural justice. That 33 employees junior to him are still working with the IIInd Party, termination of his services

is illegal. On such grounds, workman is praying for his reinstatement with back wages.

IInd Party filed Written Statement at Page 5/1 to 5/3. IInd Party had denied all material allegations of workman in his statement of claim. It is not disputed that workman was working as driver in Kusmunda Project. In order to fill vacancies of Driver, management sent requisition to Divisional Employment Exchange Office, Korba to sponsor suitable candidates as per terms. For post of drivers minimum qualifications required was High School Pass with 3 Years driving experience. The employment exchange sponsored name of Ist Party workman. He was found suitable and selected for the post of Driver on 26-7-89. Workman was appointed on probation. After verification of qualification, it was found that the Principal of Govt. Boys Higher Secondary School, Chhappa intimated *vide* letter dated 11-10-89 that marksheet and School Leaving Certificate produced by workman were false. As per Condition-6 of the appointment order, service of Ist Party workman was terminated on the ground that he submitted false and fabricated documents for carrying the job. IInd Party reiterates that no chargesheet was required. It was not necessary to conduct enquiry against workman. The services of workman could be terminated as per Clause-6 of the appointment order. On such ground, IInd Party prays for rejection of claim.

4. Workman submitted rejoinder at Page 8/1 to 8/3. Workman submits that in appointment order, it was nowhere mentioned that the appointment was on probation subject to verification of his qualification. That contentions of IInd Party on the point of misrepresentation of the fact that he has made clear that he was not having requisite qualification for appointment, that he had passed 10th standard from Gurunanak Khalsa High Secondary school, Orrissa. That he cannot be made guilty of fabricative, bogus certificate. On such grounds, Ist Party workman reiterates that he was terminated from service without giving opportunity.

5. Considering pleadings on record, the points which arise for my consideration and determination are as under. My findings are recorded against each of them for the reasons as below:

"(i) Whether the action of the

In Affirmative

management of Kusmunda Project of SECL, Bilaspur Justified in terminating the service of Shri Jarnail Singh as Driver (Trainee) w.e.f. 23-12-89 is legal?

(ii) If not, what relief the workman is entitled to?"

Workman is not entitled to relief claimed by him.

## REASONS

6. Workman is challenging termination of his service without showcause notice, chargesheet of enquiry. That termination of his services on the ground of submitting false documents for his appointment as Driver. The management has denied contentions of workman in Statement of claim filed on record. Workman in his affidavit of evidence has stated he is resident of T.R. Ghuddeva colony, Qr. No. 23/2, Post office Bankimongra, District Bilaspur. That he had passed 10th standard in 1978 Gurunanak High School, Orissa. That he was residing at Bilaspur. He was running 4 wheeler, he has obtained driving license, that he was called for interview on 10-3-82 for the driver post. On 19-8-89, he was appointed at Kusmunda Section. He was terminated from 22-12-89 without showcause notice or chargesheet. No enquiry was conducted against him. That he had submitted false document for obtaining appointment. In his cross-examination, workman says that he had passed test around 1976-77 from Matkambeda Kalinga school. His name was sponsored through Employment Exchange. That in 1981, he was shifted to Bilaspur as his sister was residing there. He had obtained driving license, he was called for interview. That he had not submitted any documents at the time of his interview. He received appointment letter Exhibit M-1. He has submitted biodata. He admits his signature on documents No. 12/3 but denied its contents. That in document 12/3, address of his school is wrongly shown. That he had not studied in Govt. school Chhappa. He denied document 12/4, 12/5. He had not submitted those documents with management. He admits Paper 12/8 marked Exhibit M-2 i.e. termination order dated 12-12-1989. The reason given for termination of workman is that on verification of record from Principal, Govt. High Secondary school, Chhappa, it was revealed that workman was never student of that school. The certificate submitted by him was not authentic or genuine. The appointment letter Exhibit M-1 produced by IInd Party Clause-6 provides—the appointment is subject to verification of his character and antecedents after your reporting for duty, if any adverse remarks regarding your character and antecedents are received from the Govt. Authorities in the basis of verification carried out by them, your services will be terminated without notice and without assigning any reasons even during the period of service when are regularly retained by the administration. The termination of service of workman is as per above clause, no chargesheet was issued to workman.

7. Management filed affidavit of evidence of Shri P.V. Satyanarayana, that management had sent requisition to Divisional Employment Exchange, Korba for vacancies of Driver. In Para-4 management's witness has stated that minimum qualification was High School passed with 3 years

experience of Driving Motor Vehicle. The workman was found suitable. He was appointed as per document Exhibit M-1. His services were terminated as the certificate produced by workman was found false as per report received from Govt. Boys High Secondary School, Chhappa. Management's witness in his cross-examination says that he had not participated in proceeding before ALC. Workman never worked under him. He was not member of the Selection Committee. Departmental Enquiry was not conducted against workman. He denies that since workman joined service, documents about his educational qualifications were not called from him. That service of workman was terminated as per standing orders. He was not paid compensation. From further evidence of management's witness Document Exhibit M-6 is proved *i.e.* letter issued from Principal, Govt. High Secondary School that workman was not student of that school. In his cross-examination, management's witness was unable to tell whether copy of application given to the Govt. High School, Chhappa is produced on record. He admits that original marksheets of workman and entry in admission register of workman are not produced. He had not seen original marksheets and admission register of workman. He had not seen document referred in Exhibit W-6.

8. Workman has produced documents W-1 Transfer certificate from Gunanak Khalsa High School Barbil, Distt Kalinga, his date of admission is shown 19.10.73 and date of leaving school is 22-12-1978. He was student of 10th standard. Exhibit W-2 is duplicate marksheets of passing 10th standard examination in 1978. Both Exhibit W-1 & W-2 are duplicates issued on 17-7-90. If Exhibit W-2 is accepted, workman had passed 10th standard examination in 1978. He had secured 379 marks out of 900.

9. The affidavit of witness Shri Suraj Singh Yadav was filed by workman in support of above documents. Said witness was not cross-examined. Management has produced documents Exhibit 12/4/, 12/5/ copies of transfer certificate of workman from Govt. High Secondary school, Chhappa, 12/5 is copy of Marksheets of passing secondary school examination in 1977, the marks secured by workman are shown. Document 12/6 shows marks obtained by the workman. In biodata form Exhibit M-4 information is shown that workman had passed 10th standard examination from Chhappa in 1979 with 58% marks. The workman had secured IIInd division. Workman in his cross-examination admitted signature on said document. Initially he had denied signature on document. As per evidence of handwriting expert, the signature on biodata form is of the workman. The workman claims in his evidence that the contents of biodata form were not filled by him. Clause V of appointment letter contemplates verification of the character and

educational qualifications. The information submitted in biodata form was found false. Workman in his cross-examination claims that he has not submitted any document at the time of interview that he had passed examination from School in Orissa, he has not explained why information in biodata form Exhibit M-4 was not corrected. The documents Exhibit W-1, W-2 produced by workman are duplicates. He has not explained what were the reasons to obtain duplicate documents Exhibit W-1, W-2 after termination of his service. The termination of service of workman after receiving information that the workman was not student of Govt. School, Chhappa cannot be said illegal. The documents Exhibit W-1, W-2 are produced subsequently to letter received from Principal Govt. School, Chhappa. On 11-10-89, Principal of Govt. School Chhappa has reported that workman was not student of said school, the documents were bogus. IIInd Party has produced those documents at Page 12/4, 12/5. Management's witness stated those documents 12/5 & 12/5 were produced by workman alongwith biodata form, there was no reason for management of IIInd party to verify its genuineness from Principal, Govt. School Chhappa. It is reported that workman was not studying in said school and the documents were bogus. The document produced by workman Exhibit W-1, W-2 were not produced with biodata Exhibit No. 3 and appears obtained subsequently to suit defence of the workman. Therefore I record my finding on Point No. 1 in Affirmative.

10. Point No. 2- In view of any finding in Point No. 1, as the document submitted by workman regarding his educational qualifications were found bogus, the services of Ist Party workman are terminated as per Clause-V of the appointment letter, workman is not entitled for relief claimed by him. There was no reason for IIInd Party to receive those documents from any other source. Though reliance is placed in ratio held in Case of Prithpal Singh versus State of Punjab and others reported in 2002 (10) Supreme Court Cases 133. The ratio cannot be applied to present case at hand as the services of workman were terminated giving reasons the documents about the educational qualification submitted by workman were found bogus, the termination cannot be said stigmatic. Therefore I record my finding in Point No. 1 in Affirmative.

11. In the result, award is passed as under:—

- (1) The action of the management of Kusmunda Project of SECL, Bilaspur justified in terminating the service of Shri Jarnail Singh as Driver (Trainee) w.e.f 23-12-89 is legal.
- (2) Workman is not entitled to relief prayed by him.

R.B. PATLE, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 22 अप्रैल, 2014

**का०आ० 1328.—ऑद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 ( 1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार एस०सी०एल० के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट ऑद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/अमन्यायालय हैदराबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 17/2012) को प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 22/04/2014 को प्राप्त हुआ था।**

[सं० एल-22012/10/2012-आई आर (सीएम-II)]  
बी०एम० पटनायक, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 22nd April, 2014

**S.O. 1328.—**In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 17/2012) of the Cent. Govt. Indus. Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Hyderabad as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial dispute between the management of M/s. Singareni Collieries Co. Limited, and their workman, received by the Central Government on 22/04/2014.

[No. L-22012/10/2012-IR(CM-II)]  
B.M. PATNAIK, Desk Officer

#### ANNEXURE

#### BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD

**PRESENT :** Smt. M. VIJAYA LAKSHMI, Presiding Officer

Dated the 29th day of January, 2014

#### INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE NO. I.D. 17/2012

##### BETWEEN:

The State Dy. General Secretary,  
(Sri T. Raja Reddy),  
Singareni Collieries Employees Union (CITU),  
Qtr. No. D-9, Shramika Bhavan, Main Chowrasta,  
Shivaji Nagar, Godavarikhani,  
Karimnagar District. .... Petitioner

##### AND

The General Manager,  
M/s. Singareni Collieries Company Limited,  
Ramagundam-II Area, GDK-8 Inc., Colony (P.O.),  
Godavarikhani, Karimnagar Distt-505211  
.... Respondent

##### APPEARANCES :

For the Petitioner : NIL

For the Respondent : M/s P.A.V.V.S. Sarma & Vijaya Lakshmi P., Advocates

#### AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its Order No. L-22012/10/2012-IR(CM-II) dated 26.4.2012 referred the following dispute between the management of M/s. Singareni Collieries Company Ltd., and their workman under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 for adjudication to this Tribunal. The reference is,

#### SCHEDELE

"Whether the action the management of General Manager of M/s. Singareni Collieries Company Ltd., Ramagundam-II Area, Godavarikhani, Karimnagar Dist., Designating Sri Kumabala Laxmaiah, Ex-Pump Operatory category-III as piece-rated workers Grade-I and later redesignating as General Mazdoor (surface) by protecting wages in Cat-I instead of Cat-III with effect from 6.4.1992 and 15.11.1994 respectively is justified or not? To what relief the concerned workman is entitled.?

The reference is numbered in this Tribunal as I.D. No. 17/2012 and notices were issued to the parties.

2. The case stands posted for filing of claim statement and documents.

3. Petitioner called absent. Claim statement not filed and there is no representation. Inspite of receiving notice twice, Petitioner is not appearing and taking interest in the proceedings. In the circumstances, taking that petitioner got no claim to be made, 'Nil'award is passed."

Award Passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. P. Phani Gowari, Personal Assistant, corrected by me on this the 29th day of January, 2014.

M. VIJAYA LAKSHMI, Presiding Officer

#### Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the Petitioner	Witnesses examined for the Respondent
NIL	NIL

#### Documents Marked for the Petitioner

NIL

#### Documents marked for the Respondent

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 22 अप्रैल, 2014

का०आ० 1329.—ओद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार एस०सी०एल० के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट ओद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार ओद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 13/2013) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 22/04/2014 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[स० एल-22012/199/2012-आईआर(सी एम-II)]  
बी०एम० पटनायक, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 22nd April, 2014

**S.O. 1329.**—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 13/2013) of the Cent. Govt. Indus. Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Hyderabad as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial dispute between the management of M/s. Singareni Collieries Co. Limited, and their workman, received by the Central Government on 22/04/2014.

[No. L-22012/199/2012-IR(CM-II)]  
B.M. PATNAIK, Desk Officer

#### ANNEXURE

#### BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD

**PRESENT:** Smt. M. VIJAYA LAKSHMI, Presiding Officer

Dated the 19th day of March, 2014

#### INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE NO. I.D. 13/2013

#### BETWEEN:

The President,  
(Sri Bandari Satyanarayana)  
Telangana Trade Union Council,  
H.No.- 5-295, Indra Nagar,  
Opp. Bus Stand, Mancherial,  
Adilabad Dist. - 504208 ..... Petitioner

#### AND

The General Manager,  
M/s. Singareni Collieries Company Limited,  
Sreerampur Area, Sreerampur ,  
Adilabad Distt.-504292 .... Respondent

#### APPEARANCES:

For the Petitioner : NIL

For the Respondent : M/s P.A.V.V.S. Sarma & Vijaya Lakshmi Panguluri, Advocates

#### AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. L-22012/199/2012-IR(CM-II) dated 30.11.2012 referred the following dispute between the management of M/s. Singareni Collieries Company Ltd., and their workman under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 for adjudication to this Tribunal. The reference is,

#### SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the Chief General Manager of M/s. Singareni Collieries Company Ltd., Sreerampur Area, Sreerampur, Adilabad District in terminating the services of Shri Siddam Muthyalu, Ex-Coal Filler, RK-6 Inc., SCCL, Sreerampur Area with effect from 18.11.1998 is justified or not? To what relief the applicant is entitled for?"

The reference is numbered in this Tribunal as I.D. No. 13/2013 and notices were issued to the parties.

2. The case stands posted for filing of claim statement and documents.

3. Petitioner called absent and there is no representation. Claim statement not filed. Inspite of giving fair opportunity again and again Petitioner is not taking interest in the proceedings and is not making any claim. In the circumstances, taking that there is no claim to be made, 'Nil' award is passed.

Award passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. P. Phani Gowari, Personal Assistant, corrected by me on this the 19th day of March, 2014.

M. VIJAYA LAKSHMI, Presiding Officer

#### Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for ..... Witnesses examined for the

the Petitioner ..... Respondent

NIL ..... NIL

#### Documents Marked for the Petitioner

NIL

#### Documents marked for the Respondent

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 22 अप्रैल, 2014

का० आ० 1330.—ओद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एस० सी० सी० एल० के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट ओद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 15/2013) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 22/04/2014 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं० एल० 22012/206/2012-आई आर (सी-एम-II)]  
बी०एम० पटनायक, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 22nd April, 2014

**S.O. 1330.**—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No.15/2013) of the Cent. Govt. Indus. Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Hyderabad as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of M/s. Singareni Collieries Co. Ltd., and their workmen, received by the Central Government on 22/04/2014.

[No. L-22012/206/2012-IR(CM-II)]  
B.M. PATNAIK, Desk Officer

#### ANNEXURE

#### BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD

**PRESENT:** Smt. M. VIJAYA LAKSHMI, Presiding Officer

Dated the 19th day of March, 2014

#### INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. I.D. 15/2013

#### BETWEEN:

The President,  
(Sri Bandari Satyanarayana)  
Telangana Trade Union Council,  
H.No.- 5-295, Indra Nagar,  
Opp. Bus Stand, Mancherial,  
Adilabad Dist. - 504208 ..... Petitioner

#### AND

The General Manager,  
M/s. Singareni Collieries Company Limited,  
Bellampally Area, Goleti Township,  
Adilabad Distt.-504292 .... Respondent

#### APPEARANCES:

For the Petitioner	:	NIL
For the Respondent	:	M/s P.A.V.V.S. Sarma & Vijaya Lakshmi Panguluri, Advocates

#### AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. L-22012/206/2012-IR(CM-II) dated 4.12.2012 referred the following dispute between the management of M/s. Singareni Collieries Company Ltd., and their workman under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 for adjudication to this Tribunal. The reference is,

#### SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the Chief General Manager, M/s. Singareni Collieries Company Ltd., Bellampally Area, Goleti Township, Adilabad District in disempanelling Shri Rangu Mallaiah, Ex-Coal Filler, MVK-5 Inc., SCCL, Bellampalli Area with effect from 20.9.2000 is justified or not? To what relief the applicant is entitled for?"

The reference is numbered in this Tribunal as I.D. No. 15/2013 and notices were issued to the parties.

2. The case stands posted for filing of claim statement and documents.

3. Petitioner called absent and there is no representation. Claim statement not filed. In spite of giving fair opportunity again and again Petitioner is not taking interest in the proceeding and is not making any claim. In the circumstances, taking that there is no claim to be made, 'Nil' award is passed.

Award passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. P. Phani Gowri, Personal Assistant, corrected by me on this the 19th day of March, 2014.

M. VIJAYA LAKSHMI, Presiding Officer

#### Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the Petitioner	Witnesses examined for the Respondent
NIL	NIL

#### Documents Marked for the Petitioner

NIL

#### Documents marked for the Respondent

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 22 अप्रैल, 2014

**का० आ० 1331.—**ओद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एस० सी० सी० एल० के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट ओद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 16/2013) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 22/04/2014 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं० एल० 22012/205/2012-आई आर (सीएम-II)]  
बी०एम० पटनायक, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 22nd April, 2014

**S.O. 1331.**—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 16/2013) of the Cent. Govt. Indus. Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Hyderabad as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of M/s. Singareni Collieries Co. Ltd., and their workmen, received by the Central Government on 22/04/2014.

[No. L-22012/205/2012-IR(CM-II)]  
B.M. PATNAIK, Desk Officer

#### ANNEXURE

#### BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD

**PRESENT :** Smt. M. VIJAYA LAKSHMI, Presiding Officer

Dated the 19th day of March, 2014

#### INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. I.D. 16/2013

#### BETWEEN:

The President,  
(Sri Bandari Satyanarayana)  
Telangana Trade Union Council,  
H.No.- 5-295, Indra Nagar,  
Opp. Bus Stand, Mancherial,  
Adilabad Dist. - 504208 ..... Petitioner

#### AND

The General Manager,  
M/s. Singareni Collieries Company Limited,  
Bellampally Area, Goleti Township,  
Adilabad Distt.-504292 .... Respondent

#### APPEARANCES:

For the Petitioner : NIL

For the Respondent : M/s P.A.V.V.S. Sarma & Vijaya Lakshmi Panguluri, Advocates

#### AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. L-22012/205/2012-IR(CM-II) dated 4.12.2012 referred the following dispute between the management of M/s. Singareni Collieries Company Ltd., and their workman under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 for adjudication to this Tribunal. The reference is,

#### SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the Chief General Manager, M/s. Singareni Collieries Company Ltd., Bellampally Area, Goleti Township, Adilabad District in disempanelling Shri Thokala Ramulu, Ex-Coal Filler, Galeti-I Inc., SCCL, Bellampalli Area with effect from 12.5.2005 is justified or not? To what relief the applicant is entitled for?"

The reference is numbered in this Tribunal as I.D. No. 16/2013 and notices were issued to the parties.

2. The case stands posted for filing of claim statement and documents.

3. Petitioner called absent and there is no representation. Claim statement not filed. In spite of giving fair opportunity again and again Petitioner is not taking interest in the proceeding and is not making any claim. In the circumstances, taking that there is no claim to be made, 'Nil' award is passed.

Award passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. P. Phani Gowri, Personal Assistant, corrected by me on this the 19th day of March, 2014.

M. VIJAYA LAKSHMI, Presiding Officer

#### Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for ..... Witnesses examined for the

the Petitioner

Respondent

NIL

NIL

#### Documents Marked for the Petitioner

NIL

#### Documents marked for the Respondent

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 25 अप्रैल, 2014

**कांग्रेस 1332.—ऑटोग्राफिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार स्टेट बैंक ऑफ त्रावनकोर प्रबंध तंत्र के संबंद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट ऑटोग्राफिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औटोग्राफिक अधिकरण, अरनाकुलम के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 18/2012) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 26/03/2014 को प्राप्त हुआ था।**

[संख्या-एल-12012/30/2011-आई आर (बी-1)]  
सुमिति सकलानी, अनुभाग अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 25th April, 2014

**S.O. 1332.—**In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 18/2012) of the Central Govt. Indus. Tribunal-cum Labour Court, Ernakulam as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of State Bank of Travancore and their workmen, received by the Central Government on 26/03/2014.

[No. L-12012/30/2011-IR(B-I)]  
SUMATI SAKLANI, Section Officer

#### ANNEXURE

#### BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, ERNAKULAM

**PRESENT:** Shri D. Sreevallabham, B.Sc., LL.B.,  
Presiding Officer

(Wednesday the 26th day of February, 2014/07th  
Phalgun 1935)

#### I.D. 18/2012

Workman : Smt. Sarasamma  
W/o Thankappan  
Paradayil Veedu  
Kuravankuzhy P.O.  
Pullad, Thiruvalla  
Kerala State  
By Adv. A V Xavier

Management : The Managing Director  
State Bank of Travancore  
Head Office  
Poojappura  
Trivandrum  
By Adv. P Ramakrishnan

This case coming up for final hearing on 26.02.2014 and this Tribunal-cum-Labour Court on the same day passed the following :

#### AWARD

In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section (2A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Government of India/Ministry of Labour by its Order No.-L-12012/30/2011-IR(B-I) dated 29.03.2012 referred the following industrial dispute for adjudication to this tribunal.

2. The dispute is:

"Whether the action of the management of State Bank of Travancore, Kozhencery Branch in terminating the services of Smt. Sarasamma w.e.f. 19.05.2010 is legal and justified? To what relief the Smt. Sarasamma is entitled?"

3. After appearance of both the parties and submission of pleadings the case was posted in the Lok Adalath as agreed to by both the parties. In the Lok Adalath there was a full and final settlement of all the claims and both the parties jointly filed compromise. Hence an award can be passed accepting the compromise.

4. In the result an award is passed as per the terms of the compromise and the compromise will form part of the award.

The award will come into force one month after its publication in the Official Gazette.

Dictated to the Personal Assistant, transcribed and typed by her, corrected and passed by me on this the 26th day of February, 2014.

D. SREEVALLABHAM, Presiding Officer

#### APPENDIX-NIL

#### IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, ERNAKULAM ID NO. 18/2012

Smt. Sarasamma, W/o Thankappan, Paradayil Veedu, Kuravankuzhy P.O., Pullad, Thiruvalla, Kerala State.	..... Workman
--	---------------

Vs. The Managing Director, State Bank of Travancore, Head Office, Poojappura, Trivandrum.	..... Management
---	------------------

The matter was taken up in Lok Adalat and the parties agreed to settle the dispute on the following terms:—

1. The management agrees to pay a sum of Rs. 50,000 (Rupees Fifty thousand only), to the workman in full and final settlement of all the claims of the worker

against the Management.

2. Upon receiving the said amount, the worker will not have any further monetary claim or claim for employment against the Management in connection with her alleged employment under the Management.
3. A Banker's Cheque for Rs. 50,000/- (Rupees Fifty Thousand only) bearing No. 525899 dated 07.02.2014 favouring Smt. Sarasamma drawn on State Bank of Travancore, Kottayam Civil Station Branch is handed over to the worker on this day towards full and final settlement of all claims of the worker in I.D. No. 18/2012.

Dated this the 20th day of February, 2014.

Workman:	Management:
Sd/-	Sd/-
Counsel for Workman:	Counsel for Management:
Sd/-	Sd/-

नई दिल्ली, 25 अप्रैल, 2014

**का०आ० 1333.—ऑद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार स्टेट बैंक ऑफ हैदराबाद प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट ऑद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार ऑद्योगिक अधिकरण, हैदराबाद के पंचाट संदर्भ संख्या (न० एल सी 73/2006, 14/2007) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 16/04/2014 को प्राप्त हुआ था।**

[सं० एल-12012/20/2006-आई आर (बी-1)]

सुमिति सकलानी, अनुभाग अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 25th April, 2014

**S.O. 1333.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (No. LC 73/2006 & ID 14/2007) of the Central Govt. Indus. Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Hyderabad as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of State Bank of Hyderabad and their workmen, received by the Central Government on 16/04/2014.**

[No. L-12012/20/2006-IR(B-I)]

SUMATI SAKLANI, Section Officer

#### ANNEXURE

#### BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, ERNAKULAM

**PRESENT:** Smt. M. Vijayan Lakshmi,

Presiding Officer

Dated the 28th day of February, 2014

#### COMMON AWARD

#### IN INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE Nos. L.C. 73/2006 AND ID. 14/2007

#### BETWEEN:

Sri A. Ramesh  
S/o A. Sailoo,  
C/o A.P. Industrial Employees Union,  
"House of Labour", King Kothi Road,  
Hyderabad-29. ....Petitioner

#### AND

1. The Dy. General Manager,  
Personnel Department,  
State Bank of Hyderabad,  
Gunfoundry, Head Office,  
Hyderabad.
2. The Branch Manager,  
State Bank of Hyderabad,  
Nallakunta Branch,  
Nallakunta,  
Hyderabad ....Respondents

#### APPEARANCES:

For the Petitioner : M/s. V. Viswanatham & R. Dushyantla, Advocates

For the Respondent : Sri A.V.S.S. Prasad, Advocate

#### COMMON AWARD

Sri A. Ramesh invoking Sec. 2A(2) of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (who will be referred to as workman) has filed this petition against the Respondents seeking for passing an award directing the Respondent to reinstate the Petitioner into service from 1.6.2006 with full back wages and all other attendant benefits with continuity of service and to pay interest @ 12% p.a. on the back wages and costs.

2. While so a reference in ID No. 14/2007 has been received by this forum from Government of India, Ministry of Labour and Employment, New Delhi vide order No.L-12012/20/2006-IR(B-I) dated 19.1.2007, whereunder, this forum has been invited to give award on the questions of,

"Whether the action of the management of State Bank of Hyderabad, not regularising the services of Sri A. Ramesh, Casual Labour, working since 1997 is legal and justified? If not, what relief the workman is entitled to?"

By virtue of the order dated 30.9.2008, these two cases i.e., LC 73/2006 and ID 14/2007 were clubbed together and the proceedings were conducted commonly for both these matters in LC 73/2006.

3. No specific claim statement has been filed by the Petitioner in ID 14/2007.

4. The averments made in LC 73/2006 filed by the Petitioner in brief are as follows:

Petitioner was appointed by the 2nd Respondent with the consent and permission of the 1st Respondent on 10th June, 1997 as casual labour and his last drawn wages was Rs. 50/- per day, whereas casual labours working at Gunfoundry Branch and Kakatiyanagar Branch are being paid wages @ Rs. 130/- per day. Petitioner was pleading since long time that he was being paid less wages. He worked with the Respondent continuously but as per their usual practice no written orders were issued. He was never engaged in the exigencies of the work as and when necessary and was never paid same amount as per the work, without hindrance he entered into the bank along with the regular employees and performed duties entrusted to him by the 2nd Respondent. But he was deprived equal pay for equal work. He completed 240 days in every calendar year. He used to work from 10 AM to 11.30 PM to help and assist the staff in finalizing the work, after banking hours. 2nd Respondent appreciated his work and in the year 1998 forwarded Petitioner's application for absorption on 4.4.2002. This document clearly show that there is no break in service of the Petitioner from 1997. Since his services were not regularized inspite of several representations though Respondents regularized services of several others without the media of Employment Exchange. He approached his union who in turn raised a dispute under Sec. 2k for regularization before the Conciliation Officer, Assistant Labour Commissioner (C) who admitted the dispute and as the conciliation failed, he closed proceedings and submitted report to the government *vide* their letter 24.1.2006. Respondent not only paid less wages but also deprived the Petitioner of payment of bonus, whereas there are orders in the shape of circular by the Respondents that the casual employees are entitled for bonus. Having no alternative Petitioner filed MP 49/2005 claiming for difference of the amount due to him invoking Sec. 33 C (2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. In the circumstances 2nd Respondent with prejudiced mind has terminated the services of the Petitioner orally from 1.6.2006 which is unfair labour practice. On such illegal termination Petitioner issued notice dated 2.6.2006 which the Respondents received but there is no response from him. Such oral termination of the Petitioner's service is illegal, inoperative and improper and without any valid reason. Petitioner has successfully completed continuous service from June, 1997 to 31.5.2006. Inspite of it Sec. 25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 was not followed. He is entitled for reinstatement into service. Hence, the petition.

5. Respondents filed their common counter in LC 73/2006 and ID 14/2007, with the averments in brief as follows:

A.P. Industrial Employee Union does not have any locus stand to file this case on behalf of the Petitioner, as it is neither an association recognized by the Bank nor having the employees of the bank as members. Further Petitioner is not a workman as per Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. He is not an employee of the bank. As such, petition is liable to be dismissed. Further as per the verdict of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the case of Secretary, State of Karnataka and others (Vs.) Umadevi and three others, reported in at (2006) 4 SCC page 1, casual labour/temporary employee do not have any right to regular or permanent public employment as they accepted the employment fully knowing the nature of their employment at their own violation and with eyes open as to the nature of their illegal employment, which is not as per constitutional provisions and the appointment is not as per due process of selection as envisaged by the relevant rules and also held that the courts should not perpetuate illegalities, irregularities or improprieties. Thus, the petition under Section 2A(2) of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is not maintainable in law or on facts. The contention of the Petitioner that he was employed on casual basis since 1997 by the 2nd Respondent and 2nd Respondent was making payment of Rs. 50/- per day though the casual labours working in the other branches like Kakatiyanagar branch and Gunfoundry branch are being paid more wages, that Petitioner was working continuously without any break and completed 240 days in a calendar year, that he made request for written letter of appointment and for correct wages and was assured of the same and was not granted the same, that 2nd Respondent extracted the work from 10AM to 11.30PM without giving any break are all incorrect. Petitioner never worked for 240 days in a calendar year and he was never employed in the year 1997 nor terminated on 1.6.2006. Payment of wages made to casual workers of Kakatiyanagar branch and Gunfoundry branch were covered by some orders which were passed by competent courts basing on the records. Placing the Petitioner with such persons stating that their respective cases are identical is incorrect and is not maintainable in Law and on facts. The present claim petition is filed as counter making claims which got nothing to the state of affairs concerning the Petitioner who is a daily employee and whose services were utilized as and when need arose is not at all correct. The documents relied upon by the Petitioner are self-serving and they are not official record of the bank. The mode and manner in which such documents were obtained in not made out. Notice for termination dated 2.6.2006 given by the Petitioner is an after thought with a mind set for filing the present petition. Provisions of Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 are not applicable to him as the Petitioner is not a permanent employee and

since his claim that he successfully continued in service from June, 1997 to 31.5.2006 and that he was terminated on 1.6.2006 are all incorrect. He was engaged on casual basis as and when work arose, in the branch due to various reasons. His claim that his services were terminated to harass him as he approached courts is far from truth and it is an attempt to abuse due process of law. He was never appointed by the bank nor appointment letter was issued to him. He was paid as per the norms and understanding of the work done. He was engaged to do the work which is casual in nature and which arise intermittently. For doing regular work bank recruits staff by complying with the provisions stipulated after taking into account the guidelines issued by the Government of India from time to time in accordance with constitutional provisions. As such, employment itself is illegal. Therefore, the reinstatement into service can not be claimed that too with full back wages and attendant benefits with continuity of service and also interest. Government of India, Ministry of Finance, Department of Economic Affairs (Banking Division) had issued circular dated 6.8.1990 directing the recruitment of temporary employees in the clerical/subordinate cadre shall be stopped forthwith. For the staff which was then on the rolls of the banks, they shall be regularized as provided in the approach paper in terms of the circular issued at that time. These are all specific directions of Banks to make temporary appointment till the problem of existing temporary employees is fully resolved and for future requirements, Banks would have to approach Government and would have go by such modalities as would be laid down by the Government through regular process of recruitment enshrined in the constitution. Engagement of Petitioner is illegal because such appointments on casual basis were obtained by the Petitioner without following the procedure of their names being forwarded by the Employment Exchange, without following the rule of reservation and the procedure for appointment of employees in the subordinate cadre as prescribed by the rules of the Respondent bank. Further, as per the verdict of Hon'ble Supreme Court the candidates lack any eligibility of qualification in any manner it would not possible to consider for regularizations as casual labours and that long duration of service would also not be relevant condition to regularize the service. Appointment against non-existent vacancy is also not maintainable and such person is entitled for regularization. In this case there was no vacancy in the regular basis but the Petitioner was engaged on daily wages basis to meet the exigencies. Even such employment can not be regularized unless regularized through prescribed procedure. Daily wage labourers whose services were engaged on the basis of need of work, such termination

does not constitute as retrenchment. Such termination is not arbitrary as they are need based. It is well settled principle that an appointment made in violation of mandatory provisions constituted and non-possession of minimum educational or technical qualifications and other essential qualifications etc., would be wholly illegal. Those who come by back door should go through the door. Since Petitioner has been engaged to meet the exigencies only he is not a workman and he is not entitled for equal emoluments or equal pay to that of regular employees. Regularization can not be claimed as a matter of right, specially when it is illegal appointment. Petition is liable to be dismissed with exemplary costs.

6. To substantiate the contentions of the Petitioner WW1 was examined and Ex. W1 to W3 were marked. Ex. W1 is the application forwarded by the Branch Manager. Ex. W2 is the list of casual employees who were regularized. Ex. W3 is the representation to the Bank Mnager dated 2.6.2006. On behalf of the management MW1 was examined. No documentary evidence has been produced by the management.

7. Heard the arguments of the either party. Written arguments were also filed by the Petitioner and the same are received and considered.

**8. Point that arises for determination is:**

Whether the Petitioner is workman and whether termination of his services is legal and justified? If so, to what relief the Petitioner is entitled?

**9. Point:**

As far as the present dispute is concerned, through Ex. W1 to W3 coupled with his own oral evidence as WW1, Petitioner could established before this court that he has been working as casual labour with the Respondent bank since June, 1997 and management could not produce any material evidence against the contention of the Petitioner that he worked with the Respondent from 10.6.1997 to 31.5.2006. Thus, it can safely be taken that Petitioner has worked with the Respondent bank since June, 1997 as casual labour and therefore, he is a workman for all purposes. Contra contentions of the Respondent are not acceptable.

10. As can be gathered from the material on record, Petitioner who applied for his absorption in bank's regular service by making applications time and again, has raised an industrial dispute seeking for regularization of his service with the Respondent bank by approaching Assistant Labour Commissioner (C). Assistant Labour Commissioner (C) has made efforts to conciliate the matter, and evidently such conciliation proceedings failed.

11. While things stood so, instead of regularising the Petitioner's services, the Respondent bank has chosen to remove him from service abruptly *w.e.f.* 1.6.2006. There on Petitioner is constrained to approach this forum by filing this dispute seeking for his reinstatement into service.

12. Evidently and admittedly there is no compliance of Sec. 25F of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 while removing the Petitioner from service. It is the contention of the Respondent that since the Petitioner is not a workman and Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 does not apply to him, there was no compliance of Sec. 25F of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

13. As already observed above, the material on record clearly discloses that Petitioner has been in continuous service as casual labour with the Respondent since June, 1994 and thus he is a workman. Thus, the provisions of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 will apply to him, therefore, his retrenchment/removal from service without complying with Sec. 25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is certainly illegal, unjust and arbitrary.

14. It is the contention of the Respondent that the principles laid down in the cases of Official Liquidator Vs. Dayanand and others (2008) 10 SCC page 1 whereunder principles laid down in the case of Umadevi Vs. State of Karnataka (2006) 4 SCC page 1 has been upheld, are applicable to the present case and that Petitioner is not entitled for the relief sought for.

15. In the above cited cases Hon'ble Supreme Court has considered the acceptable mode of public employment and non acceptable regularization of services of the persons who entered into the service by back door methods, thereby defeating the opportunity of the general public to compete for appointment to the said post etc. Present dispute is an industrial dispute. Industrial Law is totally different from Civil Law/Administrative Law. Regularization of casual workman as regular workman etc., are all governed by the Industrial laws, rules and various circulars issued by the government from time to time touching this aspects. Public employment under Civil Law/Administrative Law is totally different.

16. Further more, in this case Petitioner is not seeking for regularization of his service. What all he is questioning is the correctness of abrupt termination of his services when he questioned the inaction on the part of the Respondent bank regarding his plea for regularization of his services, that too without complying with the Sec. 25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

17. Inspite of their own admission in their counter that "Government of India, Ministry of Finance, Department of Economic Affairs (Banking Division) had issued a circular No. F-3/3/104/87-IR dated 6.8.1990 directing that all recruitment of temporary employees in the clerical/subordinate cadre shall be stopped forth with and that for the staff which was then on the rolls of the Banks, they shall be regularized as provided in the approach paper in terms of the circular issued a that time," the Respondent bank, evidently failed to take appropriate action in connection with the claims of the petition.

18. Anyway, the question whether Petitioner is entitled for regularization of services or not is not the subject matter in this petition. Even if the same is subject matter in this petition, since it is an industrial dispute, the principles laid down in the above cited cases are not applicable.

19. For all the above referred reasons, the principles laid down in the above cited cases relied upon by the Learned Counsel for the bank are not helpful to his contentions in this case.

20. There are umpteen number of legal precedents laid down by the Apex Court whereunder it is clearly laid down that the workman who is removed from service without complying with the mandatory conditions laid down in Sec. 25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is to be ordered to be reinstated into service. Thus, the Petitioner who is found to be a workman, is entitled to be reinstated into service of the bank *w.e.f.* 1.6.2006 with the benefit of continuous service. As far as back wages are concerned, since he did not render his service to the bank but not due to his own fault, he is entitled for atleast 50% of the back wages payable to him, but for the abrupt and illegal removal from service.

This point is answered accordingly.

**Result:**

In the result, petition is allowed. Petitioner shall be reinstated into service of the Respondent bank as casual labour *w.e.f.* 1.6.2006 with continuity of service. He shall be paid 50% of the back wages also forth with.

Award passed accordingly. Transmit.

Dictated to Smt. P. Phani Gowri, Personal Assistant transcribed by her corrected by me on this the 28th day of February, 2014.

M. VIJAYA LAKSHMI, Presiding Officer

**Appendix of evidence**

Witnesses examined for the	Witnesses examined for
-------------------------------	------------------------

the Petitioner	Respondent
----------------	------------

WW1: Sri A. Ramkesh	MW1: Sri Mallela Srinivas
---------------------	---------------------------

**Documents marked for the Petitioner**

- Ex. W1: Photostat copy of the application of the Petitioner dt. 4.4.2002
- Ex. W2: Photostat copy of list of the 34 casual employees of the State Bank of Hyderabad
- Ex W3: Photostat copy of representation dt. 2.6.2006 by the Petitioner to the DGM, Personnel Department and Branch Manager, Nallakunta branch.

**Documents marked for the Respondent**

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 25 अप्रैल, 2014

**कांआ० 1334.—ऑद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार स्टेट बैंक ऑफ हैदराबाद के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट ऑद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, हैदराबाद के पंचाट; संदर्भ संख्या एल सी 74/2006 12/2007) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 16/04/2014 को प्राप्त हुआ था।**

[सं० एल-12012/22/2006-आई आर (बी-1)]

सुमिति सकलानी, अनुभाग अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 25th April, 2014

**S.O.1334.—**In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (No. LC 74/2006 & ID 12/2007) of the Cent. Govt. Indus. Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Hyderabad as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the management of State Bank of Hyderabad and their workmen, received by the Central Government on 16/04/2014.

[No. L-12012/22/2006-IR(B-I)]

SUMATI SAKLANI, Section Officer

#### ANNEXURE

#### BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD

**PRESENT :** Smt. M. VIJAYA LAKSHMI, Presiding Officer

Dated the 28th day of February, 2014

#### COMMON AWARD

IN

Industrial Dispute

**Nos. L.C. 74/2006 and I. D. 12/2007**

#### BETWEEN:

Sri J. Kiran Kumar,

S/o J. Omprakash,

C/o A.P. Industrial Employees Union,

"House of Labour", King Kothi Road,

Hyderabad-29.

..Petitioner

#### AND

1. The Dy. General Manager,  
Personnel Department,  
State Bank of Hyderabad,

Gunfoundry, Head Office,  
Hyderabad.

2. The Branch Manager,  
State Bank of Hyderabad,  
Nallakunta Branch,  
Nallakunta,  
Hyderabad.

...Respondents

#### APPEARANCES:

For the Petitioner : M/s. V. Viswanatham & R. Dushyantla, Advocates

For the Respondent : Sri A.V.S.S. Prasad, Advocate

#### COMMON AWARD

Sri J. Kiran Kumar invoking Sec. 2A(2) of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (who will be referred to as workman) has filed this petition against the Respondents seeking for passing an award directing the Respondent to reinstate the Petitioner into service from 1.6.2006 with full back wages and all other attendant benefits with continuity of service and to pay interest @ 12% p.a. on the back wages and costs.

2. While so a reference in ID No. 12/2007 has been received by this forum from Government of India, Ministry of Labour and Employment, New Delhi *vide* order No. L-12012/22-2006-IR (B-I) dated 18.1.2007, whereunder, this forum has been invited to give award on the question of,

"Whether the action of the management of Statement Bank of Hyderabad, not regularising the services of Sri J. Kiran Kumar, Casual Labour, working since 1999 is legal and justified? If not, what relief the workman is entitled to?"

By virtue of the order dated 30.9.2008, these two cases i.e. LC 74/2006 and ID 12/2007 were clubbed together and the proceedings were conducted commonly for both these matters in LC 74/2006.

3. No specific claim statement has been filed by the Petitioner in ID 12/2007.

4. The averments made in LC 74/2006 filed by the Petitioner in brief are as follows:

Petitioner was appointed by the 2nd Respondent with the consent and permission of the 1st Respondent from 18th August, 1999 as casual labour and his last drawn wages was Rs. 50 per day, whereas casual labours working at Gunfoundry Branch and Kakatiyanagar Branch are being paid wages @ Rs. 130 per day. Petitioner was pleading since long time that he was being paid less wages. He worked with the Respondent continuously but as per their usual practice no written orders were issued. He was never

engaged in the exigencies of the work as and when necessary and was never paid same amount as per the work, without hindrance he entered into the bank along with the regular employees and performed duties entrusted to him by the 2nd Respondent. But he was deprived equal pay for equal work. He completed 240 days in every calendar year. He used to work from 10 AM to 11.30 PM to help and assist the staff in finalizing the work, after banking hours. 2nd Respondent appreciated his work and in the year 2002 forwarded Petitioner's application for absorption on 4.4.2002. This document clearly show that there is no break in service of the Petitioner from 1999. Since his services were not regularized inspite of several representations though Respondents regularized services of several others without the media of Employment Exchange. He approached his union who in turn raised a dispute under Sec. 2k for regularization before the Conciliation Officer, Assistant Labour Commissioner (C) who admitted the dispute and as the conciliation failed, he closed proceedings and submitted report to the government *vide* their letter 24.1.2006. Respondent not only paid less wages but also deprived the Petitioner of payment of bonus, whereas there are orders in the shape of circular by the Respondents that the casual employees are entitled for bonus. Having no alternative Petitioner filed MP 50/05 claiming for difference of the amount due to him invoking Sec. 33C(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. In the circumstances 2nd Respondent with prejudiced mind has terminated the services of the Petitioner orally from 1.6.2006 which is unfair labour practice. On such illegal termination Petitioner issued notice dated 2.6.2006 which the Respondents received but there is no response from him. Such oral termination of the Petitioner's service is illegal, inoperative and improper and without any valid reason. Petitioner has successfully completed continuous service from August, 1999 to 31.5.2006. Inspite of it Sec. 25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 was not followed. He is entitled for reinstatement into service. Hence, the petition.

5. Respondents filed their common counter in LC 74/2006 and ID 12/2007, with the averments in brief as follows:

A.P. Industrial Employee Union does not have any locus stand to file this case on behalf of the Petitioner, as it is neither an association recognized by the Bank nor having the employees of the bank as members. Further Petitioner is not a workman as per Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. He is not an employee of the bank. As such, petition is liable to be dismissed. Further as per the verdict of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the case of Secretary, State of Karnataka and others Vs. Umadevi and three others, reported in at (2006) 4 SCC page 1, casual labour/temporary employee do not have any right to regular or permanent public employment as they accepted the employment fully knowing the nature of their employment at their own

violation and with eyes open as to the nature of their illegal employment, which is not as per constitutional provisions and the appointment is not as per due process of selection as envisaged by the relevant rules and also held that the courts should not perpetuate illegalities, irregularities or improprieties. Thus, the petition under Section 2A(2) of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is not maintainable in law or on facts. The contention of the Petitioner that he was employed on casual basis since 1999 by the 2nd Respondent and 2nd Respondent was making payment of Rs. 50 per day though the casual labours working in the other branches like Kakatiyanagar branch and Gunfoundry branch are being paid more wages, that Petitioner was working continuously without any break and completed 240 days in a calendar year, that he made request for written letter of appointment and for correct wages and was assured of the same and was not granted the same, that 2nd Respondent extracted the work from 10AM to 11.30 PM without giving by break are all incorrect. Petitioner never worked for 240 days in a calendar year and he was never employed in the year 1999 nor terminated on 1.6.2006. Payment of wages made to casual workers of Kakatiyanagar branch and Gunfoundry branch were covered by some orders which were passed by competent courts basing on the records. Placing the Petitioner with such persons stating that their respective cases are identical is incorrect and is not maintainable in Law and on facts. The present claim petition is filed as counter making claims which got noting to the state of affairs concerning the Petitioner who is a daily employee and whose services were utilized as and when need arose is not at all correct. The documents relied upon by the Petitioner are self-serving and they are not official record of the bank. The mode and manner in which such documents were obtained in not made out. Notice for termination dated 2.6.2006 given by the Petitioner is an after thought with a mined set for filing the present petition. Provisions of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 are not applicable to him as the Petitioner is not a permanent employee and since his claim that he successfully continued in service from August, 1999 to 31.5.2006 and that he was terminated on 1.6.2006 are all incorrect. He was engaged on casual basis as and when work arose, in the branch due to various reasons. His claim that his services were terminated to harass him as he approached courts is far from truth and it is an attempt to abuse due process of law. He was never appointed by the bank nor appointment letter was issued to him. He was paid as per the norms and understanding of the work done. He was engaged to do the work which is casual in nature and which arise intermittently. For doing regular work bank recruits staff by complying with the provisions stipulated after taking into account the guidelines issued by the Government of India from time to time in accordance with constitutional provisions. As such, employment itself is illegal. Therefore, the

reinstatement into service can not be claimed that too with full back wages and attendant benefits with continuity of service and also interest. Government of India, Ministry of Finance, Department of Economic Affairs (Banking Division) had issued circular dated 6.8.1990 directing the recruitment of temporary employees in the clerical/subordinate cadre shall be stopped forthwith. For the staff which was then on the rolls of the banks, they shall be regularized as provided in the approach paper in terms of the circular issued at that time. These are all specific directions of Banks to make temporary appointment till the problem of existing temporary employees is fully resolved and for future requirements, Banks would have to approach Government and would have go by such modalities as would be laid down by the Government through regular process of recruitment enshrined in the constitution. Engagement of Petitioner is illegal because such appointments on casual basis were obtained by the Petitioner without following the procedure of their names being forwarded by the Employment Exchange, without following the rule of reservation and the procedure for appointment of employees in the subordinate cadre as prescribed by the rules of the Respondent bank. Further, as per the verdict of Hon'ble Supreme Court the candidates lack any eligibility of qualification in any manner it would not possible to consider for regularization as casual labours and that long duration of service would also not be relevant condition to regularize the service. Appointment against non-existent vacancy is also not maintainable and such persons is not entitled for regularization. In this case there was no vacancy in the regular basis but the Petitioner was engaged on daily wages basis to meet the exigencies. Even such employment can not be regularized unless regularized through prescribed procedure. Daily wage labourers whose services were engaged on the basis of need of work, such termination does not constitute as retrenchment. Such termination is not arbitrary as they are need based. It is well settled principle that an appointment made in violation of mandatory provisions constituted and non-possession of minimum educational or technical qualifications and other essential qualifications etc., would be wholly illegal. Those who come by back door should go through the door. Since Petitioner has been engaged to meet the exigencies only he is not a workman and he is not entitled for equal emoluments or equal pay to that of regular employees. Regularization can not be claimed as a matter of right, specially when it is illegal appointment. Petition is liable to be dismissed with exemplary costs.

6. To substantiate the contentions of the Petitioner WW1 was examined and Ex. W1 were marked. Ex. W1 is the application forwarded by the Branch Manager. Ex. W2 is the list casual employees who were regularized. Ex. W3 is the representation to the Bank Manager dated

2.6.2006. On behalf of the management MW1 was examined. No documentary evidence has been produced by the management.

7. Heard the arguments of the either party. Written arguments were also filed by the Petitioner and the same are received and considered.

8. Point that arises for determination is:

Whether the Petitioner is workman and whether termination of his services is legal and justified? If so, to what relief the Petitioner is entitled?

#### **9. Point:**

As far as the present dispute is concerned, through Ex W1 to W3 coupled with his own oral evidence as WW1, Petitioner could establish before this court that he has been working with the Respondent bank since August, 1999 and management could not produce any material evidence against the contention of the Petitioner that he worked with the Respondent from 18th August, 1999 to 31.5.2006. Thus, it can safely be taken that Petitioner has worked as casual labour with the Respondent bank since August, 1999 as casual labour and therefore, he is a workman for all purposes. Contra contentions of the Respondent are not acceptable.

10. As can be gathered from the material on record, Petitioner who applied for his absorption in bank's regular service by making applications time and again, has raised an industrial dispute seeking for regularization of his service with the Respondent bank by approaching Assistant Labour Commissioner (C). Assistant Labour Commissioner (C) has made efforts to conciliate the matter, and evidently such conciliation proceedings failed.

11. While things stood so, instead of regularising the Petitioner's services, the Respondent bank has chosen to remove him from service abruptly *w.e.f.* 1.6.2006. There on Petitioner is constrained to approach this forum by filing this dispute seeking for his reinstatement into service.

12. Evidently and admittedly there is no compliance of Sec. 25F of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, while removing the Petitioner from service. It is the contention of the Respondent that since the Petitioner is not a workman and Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 does not apply to him, there was no compliance of Sec. 25F of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

13. As already observed above, the material on record clearly discloses that Petitioner has been in continuous service as casual labour with the Respondent since August, 1999 and thus he is a workman. Thus, the provisions of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 will apply to

him. Therefore, his retrenchment/removal from service without complying with Sec. 25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is certainly illegal, unjust and arbitrary.

14. It is the contention of the Respondent that the principles laid down in the cases of Official Liquidator Vs. Dayanand and others (2008) 10 SCC page 1 whereunder principles laid down in the case of Umadevi Vs. State of Karnataka (2006) 4 SCC page 1 has been upheld, are applicable to the present case and that Petitioner is not entitled for the relief sought for.

15. In the above cited cases Hon'ble Supreme Court has considered the acceptable mode of public employment and non acceptable regularization of services of the persons who entered into the service by back door methods, thereby defeating the opportunity of the general public to compete for appointment to the said post etc.. Present dispute is an industrial dispute. Industrial Law is totally different from Civil Law/Administrative Law. Regularization of casual workman as regular workman etc., are all governed by the industrial laws, rules and various circulars issued by the government from time to time touching this aspects. Public employment under Civil Law/Administrative Law is totally different.

16. Further more, in this case Petitioner is not seeking for regularization of his service. What all he is questioning is the correctness of abrupt termination of his services, when he questioned the inaction on the part of the Respondent bank regarding his plea for regularization of his services, that too without complying with the Sec. 25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

17. Inspite of their own admission in their counter that "Government of India, Ministry of Finance, Department of Economic Affairs (Banking Division) had issued a circular No. F-3/3/104/87-IR dated 6.8.1990 directing that all recruitment of temporary employees in the clerical/subordinate cadre shall be stopped forth with and that for the staff which was then on the rolls of the Banks, they shall be regularized as provided in the approach paper in terms of the circular issued at that time.", the Respondent bank, evidently failed to take appropriate action in connection with the claims of the Petitioner.

18. Anyway, the question whether Petitioner is entitled for regularization of services or not is not the subject matter in this petition. Even if the same is subject matter in this petition, since it is an industrial dispute, the principles laid down in the above cited cases are not applicable.

19. For all the above referred reasons, the principles laid down in the above cited cases relied upon by the Learned Counsel for the bank are not helpful to his contentions in this case.

20. There are umpteen number of legal precedents laid down by the Apex Court whereunder it is clearly laid down that the workman who is removed from service without complying with the mandatory conditions laid down in Sec. 25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is to be ordered to be reinstated into service. Thus, the Petitioner who is found to be a workman, is entitled to be reinstated into service of the bank *w.e.f.* 1.6.2006 with the benefit of continuous service. As far as back wages are concerned, since he did not render his service to the bank but not due to his own fault, he is entitled for atleast 50% of the back wages payable to him, but for the abrupt and illegal removal from service.

This point is answered accordingly.

#### **Result:**

In the result, petition is allowed. Petitioner shall be reinstated into service of the Respondent bank as casual labour *w.e.f.* 1.6.2006 with continuity of service. He shall be paid 50% of the back wages also, forth with.

Award passed accordingly. Transmit.

Dictated to Smt. P. Phani Gowri, Personal Assistant transcribed by her corrected by me on this the 28th day of February, 2014.

M. VIJAYA LAKSHMI, Presiding Officer

#### **Appendix of evidence**

Witnesses examined for the Petitioner	Witnesses examined for the Respondent
--	--

WW1: Sri J. Kiran Kumar	MW1: Sri Mallela Srinivas
-------------------------	---------------------------

#### **Documents marked for the Petitioner**

- Ex.W1: Photostat copy of the application of the Petitioner dt. 4.4.2002
- Ex. W2: Photostat copy of list of the 34 casual employees of the State Bank of Hyderabad
- Ex. W3: Photostat copy of representation dt. 2.6.2006 by the Petitioner to the DGM, Personnel Department and Branch Manager, Nallakunta branch.

#### **Documents marked for the Respondent**

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 25 अप्रैल, 2014

का.आ. 1335.—ऑद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार कोर वैश्य बैंक लि० के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट ऑद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार ऑद्योगिक

अधिकरण, हैदराबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 80/2004) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 16/4/2014 प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल. 12012/139/2004-आईआर (बी-1)]  
सुमिति सकलानी, अनुभाग अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 25th April, 2014

**S.O. 1335.**—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 80/2004) of the Cent. Govt. Indus. Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Hyderabad as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of Kaur Vysya Bank Ltd. and their workmen, received by the Central Government on 16/04/2014.

[No. L-12012/139/2004-IR(B-I)]  
SUMATI SAKLANI, Section Officer

#### ANNEXURE

#### BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL-TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD

**PRESENT:** Smt. M. VIJAYA LAKSHMI, Presiding Officer

Dated, the 4th day of March, 2014

#### INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE NO. 80/2004

#### BETWEEN:

Sri S.V.S. Sarma,  
D.No. 23-25-11/A, Sannidhanamvari Street  
Satyanarayanaapuram, Vijayawada. ....Petitioner

#### AND

Executive Director,  
Personnel Administration Dept.,  
Karur Vysya Bank Limited,  
Central Office, Erode Road,  
Karur-639001 ....Respondent

#### APPEARANCES:

For the Petitioner : M/s. C. Niranjan Rao & M.  
Subrahmanyam Sastry,  
Advocates

For the Respondent : M/s. C.R. Sridharan, G.  
Narender Reddy, S. Ramesh,  
M. Srinivas Reddy & G.V.S.  
Ganesh, Advocates

#### AWARD

The Government of India made a reference *vide* order No. L-12012/139/2004-IR(B-I) dated 10.6.2004 requiring this forum to resolve the industrial dispute arose

in this case between the Management of Karur Vysya Bank and their workman Sri S.V.S. Sarma, by giving an award into the question.

#### SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the Management of Karur Vysya Bank Limited, Karur in dismissing from the services of Sh. S.V.S. Sarma, Ex-clerk-cum-Cashier, Dharmavaram Branch with effect from 14.12.2002 is justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled?"

After receiving the reference, this Tribunal has registered and numbered it as I.D. No. 80/2004 and issued notice to either party. They both appeared before the court and engaged their respective counsels with the leave of the court and consent of either party.

2. Petitioner filed his claim statement with the averments in brief as follows:

Petitioner has joined the service of Respondent bank as sub-staff on 14.1.1984 and rendered his services with unblemished record and to the satisfaction of the Management. His services were made permanent as attender and thereafter recognised his merit and excellent service record he was promoted as a clerk in course of time and he continued to work hard maintaining unblemished service. While so on 10.4.2000, while he was working as cashier at the Branch due to heavy work and cash payments there required the assistance of a second cashier which was not provided by the Management. Due to heavy work as a single cashier without any assistance Petitioner suffered loss of Rs. 48,000 on the said day. Said amount was recovered from his salary monthly which worsened the mental condition of the Petitioner and he suffered mental depression from that day. While so, the Branch Manager made a report alleging certain acts against the Petitioner from 17.8.2001 to 24.8.2001 and also made allegations of behaving in discourteous manner and exhibiting insubordination. It was also reported by the Branch Manager that Petitioner entered into a wager with some unnamed persons and walked naked on the streets of Dharmavaram etc. Acting on the basis of the motivated complaint of the Branch Manager, one Sri A.S. Vasudevan, Assistant General Manager, Bangalore visited and submitted his investigation report to the effect that Petitioner is guilty of serious misconducts of behaving with Branch Managing in a discourteous manner, exhibiting insubordination, failing to show proper consideration and courtesy towards the Branch Manager and walking/roaming naked on the streets of Dharmavaram. The Petitioner was kept under suspension and disciplinary proceedings were initiated

against him. Thereafter Chief Manager issued a chargesheet dated 24.10.2001. Petitioner is not at all involved in such charges levelled against him and he denied the charges. An enquiry was conducted against the Petitioner. One Sri Ashok Vennelakanti, Manager, Legal Department of the Respondent bank was appointed as Enquiry Officer. Two witnesses were examined during enquiry. Both of them seniors officials and are higher in rank to that of the Enquiry Officer. Disciplinary Authority was the Chief Manager, whereas Sri A.S. Vasudevan was superior officer to the Enquiry Officer and also Disciplinary Authority. Therefore, Enquiry Officer and Disciplinary Authority are under the influence of Sri A.S. Vasudevan. Five documents were marked during enquiry. First two of them were letters of the Branch, 3rd document was letter from the Divisional Office, 4th documents was the letter addressed by the Central Office of the Bank to the applicant and the 5th document was the reply to the applicant to the said letter. Therefore, there was absolutely no evidence in support of the charges. A show cause notice was issued by the Chief Manager dated 8.7.2002 regarding findings of the Enquiry Officer. Petitioner gave reply to the same. A newspaper publication was also relied upon by the Management. Though Petitioner was nowhere referred in the said news items. No effort was made to prove the contents of the news publication. The customers whose names are mentioned in the chargesheet were also not examined during enquiry. The other officials who are also mentioned therein were not examined. Petitioner cross examined the witnesses who are examined. Material witnesses are not examined. But the Enquiry Officer proceeded in a grossly biased manner and submitted a report holding the Petitioner guilty of the charges. He could not apply his mind instantly to the material on the record as he is junior to the witnesses examined during the enquiry. He had no discretion to assess the evidence instantly and to give correct findings. No independent witnesses were examined. The Enquiry Officer himself admitted in his findings at page 7 para 2 of his report that evidence adduced is only here say evidence. But inspite of it he found the Petitioner guilty of misconduct. Without considering the contents of the reply of the Petitioner given to show cause notice dated 8.7.2002, second show cause notice dated 8.10.2002 was issued by the Disciplinary Authority proposing the punishment of removal from service. A detailed reply has been given by the Petitioner on 24.10.2002 but the Respondent is failed to consider the same and final order dated 14.12.2002 was issued dismissing the Petitioner from service. Aggrieved by the same, Petitioner preferred an appeal before the Appellate Authority but said appeal also was dismissed inarbitrarily hearing the Presenting Officer though he go nothing to do with the appeal. Further the Appellate Authority denied

reasonable opportunity to the Petitioner to participate in the said appeal proceedings with the help of any defence assistant. The Appellate Authority admitted that Chief Manager was subordinate to the Assistant General Manager who was primary witness of the Management and also that the witnesses examined by the bank were seniors to the Enquiry Officer but he asserted that the Disciplinary Authority was not influenced. He was predetermined to dismiss the appeal. The lapse if at all occurred was occurred by the Petitioner was under serious mental depression and was undergoing treatment with the Psychiatrist. The enquiry conducted was not fair. Petitioner was not fairly treated at the hands of the Disciplinary Authority. He was a psychiatric patient and was undergoing treatment with the Psychiatrist. This information is also available in the service records of the Petitioner. He has two grown up daughters whose marriages are to be performed by him. He has also to support his aged parents. Thus, his acts were ought to have been condoned. Hence, the claim.

3. Respondents filed their counter statement with the averments in brief as follows:

The enquiry was conducted validly and properly against the Petitioner and fully in accordance with law and the principles of natural justice. In view of the hopeless and adverse past service record coupled with the grave acts of misconduct proved against his beyond any reasonable doubt he was dismissed from service and he is not entitled to any indulgence from the court. Dismissal order is not liable to be interfered with under any circumstances. Petitioner was reported to have committed certain serious acts of misconduct which include that he disobeyed the orders of the superiors, indulged in certain acts prejudicial to the interests of the bank. In view of the gravity of the acts of the misconduct reported against the Petitioner, the Respondent bank issued the chargesheet dated 24th October, 2001. The charges include meddling with bank records unauthorizedly, being disrespectful and disobedient towards his superiors, walking named on 22.8.2001 from Panduranga Circle through Gandhi Nagar, Kothapetta to Tarakaramapuram for a consideration of Rs. 50,000 lowering the dignity of the bank in the eyes of the public. Petitioner submitted his explanation which is not satisfactory. Therefore, regular departmental enquiry was ordered against him. Sri Ashok Vennelakanti, Manager-Legal Department was appointed as Enquiry Officer. Enquiry was conducted in the presence of the Petitioner. Petitioner appointed a defence representative. They were given opportunity to produce their defence evidence and they reported that they have no defence witness. Petitioner actively participated in the enquiry with the assistance of his defence assistant chosen by him who cross examined both the Management witnesses. The contents of the

chargesheet were clearly explained to the Petitioner. Thus, Petitioner was given all opportunities to fully participate in the enquiry and he availed the same. Thereafter, Enquiry Officer has given his report finding the Petitioner guilty of all charges. The report and finding of the Enquiry Officer were forwarded to the Petitioner advising him to make representation if any. He submitted his objections. Considering the findings of the Enquiry Officer and the objections of the Petitioner, Disciplinary Authority proposed to award the punishment of "Dismissal from the service of the bank without notice" and issued show cause notice to the Petitioner for such proposal. Petitioner

availed another opportunity of personal hearing on 24.10.2002 but he did not/could not give any convincing and satisfactory answers, the proposed punishment was confirmed. Particularly since the bank did not find any extenuating and mitigating circumstances to take any lenient view in the matter. Accordingly, punishment of dismissal from service from the bank without any notice was issued by final order dated 14.12.2002. Previously Petitioner was chargesheeted on five occasions for various acts of misconduct from 1996-2001 and punishments ranging from warning to stoppage of increments/reduction in the basic pay in stages have been imposed on him after said act of misconducts have been proved against him. The details of said events are as follows:

S.No.	Particulars of chargesheet and the misconduct	Particulars of punishment orders
1.	Chargesheet dated 13.8.1996 for misappropriation of Rs. 5,000 from the Bank's cash	Order dated 17.4.1997 stopping the next one increment, without the effect of postponing his future increments
2.	Chargesheet dated 21.9.1998 for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Wilful slowing down in performance of work; and</li> <li>(b) Negligence in performing duties</li> </ul>	Order dated 16.9.1998:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) reduction of basic pay by two stages; and</li> <li>(b) postponement of next one increment for a period of six months</li> </ul>
3.	Chargesheet dated 1.12.1998 for disorderly or indecent behaviour on the premises of the Bank	Order dated 9.4.1999, reduction of basic by two stages with immediate effect
4.	Chargesheet dated 20.10.2000 for disorderly or indecent behaviour on the premises of the Bank	Order dated 21.8.2001: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) reduction of basic pay by one stage;</li> <li>(b) warning; and</li> <li>(c) postponement of next one increment for a period of six months</li> </ul>
5.	Chargesheet dated 28.2.2001 for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) absence without leave; and</li> <li>(b) irregular attendance</li> </ul>	Order dated 24.3.2001 issuing warning

The cash shortage of Rs. 48,000 occurred only on account of the gross negligence on the part of the Petitioner. Serious action ought to have been initiated against the Petitioner taking a lenient view the matter was allowed to rest. Petitioner can not seek any advantage from the same. The acts of misconduct alleged in the present chargesheet came to the light through newspaper media. The media representatives were followed by the customers calling on the Manager of the Respondent bank and expressed their anguish and apprehension. The landlord of the Petitioner, Mr. J. Ravi, also discussed the matter with the Branch Manager of the Respondent bank. Further the Manager of the Branch was called by the Police authorities and in presence of the Manager the entire episode of walking naked was discussed by the Police authorities and the police warned and left the Petitioner

taking into account, his family and children. Simultaneously, the Assistant General Manager of the Divisional Office, Bangalore, also visited the Branch and at that time also several customers called on him expressing their apprehension to keep their money with the Respondent bank. The charges levelled against the Petitioner have been amply proved in the domestic enquiry held. Though the two Management witnesses examined in the enquiry are higher in rank to their Enquiry Officer, Enquiry Officer was not working under them nor he was reporting to them. Sri A.S. Vaduveen was in Bangalore Divisional Office and the Enquiry Officer Sri Ashok Vennelakanti was in the Legal Department at the Central Office located in Karur and he was reporting to the Deputy General Manager of his Department. Inevitably the Enquiry Officer has to examine in person having

knowledge of the facts relevant to charges, whether he is holding higher post in rank or otherwise. Thus, the question of higher rank is not material. No prejudice can be said to have been caused to the Petitioner in this case. The Disciplinary Authority is an independent person holding his office in central office and he reported to the then Deputy General Manager of Personnel and Administrative Department. The newspaper cutting was an enclosure to Ex. M2, the report made by the Respondent branch. A detailed investigation was done into the matter by the Assistant General Manager, Bangalore. All relevant evidence was placed to record during enquiry. The contentions that Enquiry Office and Disciplinary Authority have not applied their mind to the evidence is not correct. The Appellate Authority gave personal hearing to the Petitioner and he dealt with the points raised by the Petitioner in appeal elaborately. The contention of the Petitioner that the Enquiry Officer admitted in his findings at para 7 para 2 that evidence is only hearsay is not correct. He stated that particulars of hearsay evidence acts as 'circumstantial evidence' for the purpose of rendering his findings. He gave cogent reasons for holding the Petitioner as guilty of charges. There is neither biased nor perverse on the part of the Enquiry Officer. Verification of the time of the lunch hour from Planning and Development Department, housed in Central Office which fixed the timings for various branches/offices located throughout the country can not be taken as fact in evidence behind the available records. On the contra, it is to be taken that Enquiry Officer has put forth his best efforts to find out the truth and correct position. Contention of the Petitioner that enquiry held against him is unfair and unjust and that psychological conditions of the Petitioner during the period was not considered is not at all correct. During the appeal proceedings Appellate Authority provided the Petitioner with an opportunity to engage a defence assistant to Petitioner stated that does not require the same and that he would defend himself. Contra contentions are not correct. Petitioner's contention that he suffered mental disorder for certain period is not correct. He committed all the acts of misconduct intentionally and wilfully. The court is to note that Petitioner is indirectly admitting the charges. The order passed by the Disciplinary Authority and confirmed by the Appellate Authority is fully justified. The bank reposes more confidence in the Petitioner. It is not desirable that an employee like the Petitioner be permitted to come back into the services. Petition is liable to be dismissed.

4. By virtue of order dated 11.2.2009 domestic enquiry conducted in this case has been held as valid.

5. Heard the arguments of either party under Sec. 11A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. Written arguments

are also filed for the Petitioner and the same are considered.

#### **6. The points that arise for determination are:**

I. Whether the action of the Management of Karur Vysya Bank Limited, Karur in dismissing from the services of Sh. S.V.S. Sarma, Ex-clerk-cum-Cashier, Dharmavaram Branch with effect from 14.12.2002 is justified?

II. To what relief the workman is entitled?"

#### **7. Point No. I:**

As can be gathered from the material made available on the record, and as already observed above, the domestic enquiry conducted in this case has been held as valid by this court, by virtue of order dated 11.2.2009. The said order has not been challenged by the Petitioner and thus, it remained on record in force and therefore it is to be taken that Petitioner has not chosen to challenge the validity of domestic enquiry held in this case.

8. But, in his claim statement he made several aspirations against the Enquiry Officer and the enquiry proceedings conducted by him, like the investigation officer being junior to the witnesses examined during the enquiry etc. But, an important aspect to be noted is that the enquiry proceedings filed before the court does not reveal anywhere that the Petitioner has expressed any grievance regarding the Enquiry Officer or the enquiry proceedings either at any time during the enquiry or in the written representations given by him submitting his comments on the enquiry findings. That means, it was not his claim alone during the enquiry proceedings and until punishment was awarded to him, that his interests were prejudiced in any manner, due to the appointment of the given officer as Enquiry Officer and the other officers were being examined as witnesses during the enquiry and such other analogous aspects.

9. Further, as can be seen from the enquiry proceedings and enquiry report which are made available on record, Enquiry Officer has given ample opportunity to the Petitioner to participate in the enquiry duly and Petitioner availed of the same. The witnesses examined on behalf of the Management during enquiry were elaborately cross examined by the Petitioner in his defence and while so nothing was suggested to them implying that there was any occasion/possibility for them to exercise any influence over the decision of the Enquiry Officer.

10. The charges levelled against the Petitioner by the Management of the bank in the chargesheet dated 20.4.2001 are in two fold.

11. The first charge has been to the effect that on

17.8.2001 is about 2.30 PM *i.e.*, lunch hour the Petitioner who was on medical leave went to the Dharmavaram branch of the Respondent bank in which he was working at that time and informed the Branch manager that he would join duty on 20.8.2001 and thereafter went inside the counter, took the attendance register and started searching the filling cabinet, thereon the Branch Manager has objected for the unauthorised removal of the files by the Petitioner and advised him not to handle the office documents while on leave. For that Petitioner stated that he was looking for his leave particulars and wanted to note the same to obtain suitable medical certificate. Branch Manager allowed the Petitioner to note down required particulars. Even there after, Petitioner has not left the office and instead sat at the counter and refused to leave and thus disobeyed the reasonable orders of the Branch Manager.

12. As can be seen from the material on the record, Petitioner has admitted his attending the bank on 17.8.2001 at about 2.30 PM while he was on medical leave and his refusal to leave the bank premises inspite of Branch Manager ordering for it. His contention is that he went there to submit his leave letter and that he was badly treated by the Branch Manager and that he being a bank employee, was entitled to be in bank premises even while he was on leave and that he was hurt due to the improper treatment on the part of the Branch Manager.

13. But the fact remains that Branch Manager is the person who complained against the conduct of the Petitioner but not vice versa. Only after the enquiry was launched against the Petitioner and while defending himself, Petitioner has chosen to state that Branch Manager ill-treated him. If actually Branch Manager ill-treated him in, all likelihood he would have complained against the Branch Manager to the higher officials, even before launching of the enquiry against him. It did not happen. This is a circumstance which improbabolises the version of the Petitioner.

14. Further, Petitioner being on leave at the relevant time ought not to have meddled with the office records and ought not have been in the bank premises where there was possibility for the office records and other documents being kept, since, the persons who were on duty at that time would be the custodians of the said documents/records and they would be responsible for their safety. Therefore, such custodians of the records were their limits/rights to ask the Petitioner to be away from the place where such records/documents were. The Branch Manager was the then custodian of the records/documents in the bank, obviously. Thus, he was having every right as well as duty to ask the Petitioner, who was on leave, not to be at that place then and also to ask the Petitioner to leave the premises immediately after the purpose for

which he went there was over. Evidently, Petitioner did not do so. On the other hand, he resisted the direction given by the Branch Manager, who is his superior as well apart from being the Incharge of the office. Certainly, this conduct on the part of the Petitioner amounts to misconduct as well as disobedience and disrespect shown towards his superiors. The findings given by the Enquiry Officer with this regard are basing on the evidence made available on record during enquiry and also supported by relevant reasons.

15. No doubt the enquiry report thus, reveal that the Enquiry Officer gathered some information regarding the lunch hour in the given bank on his own. He ought not to have done so, to utilise the information so gathered in his enquiry report. But, doing so on his part has not actually prejudiced the Petitioner in any manner for the reason that enquiry findings are not mainly basing on such information it was only an incidental aspect which will not effect the enquiry findings totally. In this respect one has to take note of the fact that Petitioner is not at all disputing with the contention of the Respondent bank that, at the given time he was in Bank premises. If it was not the lunch hour and there were other persons present at the place of incident. Petitioner could have brought the fact to the notice of the Enquiry Officer by either examining such persons or by suggesting to the Management witnesses regarding the presence of such persons. He never have done so. Considering all these circumstances and since the Enquiry Officer has not based his finding regarding the 1st charge solely on the inference gathered by him on his own, it can be held that no prejudice caused to the Petitioner due to the same.

16. The second charge levelled against the Petitioner has been that he entered into a wager, with some person at Dharamavaram to walk naked on 22.8.2001 from Panduranga Circle to Gandhinagar, Kothapeta, to Tarakaramapuram for a consideration of Rs. 50000 and as per the said deal he walked naked in the streets of Dharmavaram, greeting the public to win the bet and that seeing him a bank employee, so, the public, more particularly ladies experienced difficulty and inconvenience and that his action was condemned by the local public and was also published in Eeenadu newspaper dated 24.8.2001 and further police took him into custody on 24.8.2001 between 7.30 AM and 8.00 AM and further they sent a police constable to the house of the Branch Manager and asked him to meet the Circle Inspector, which required the Branch Manager to attend the Police Station, where he found the Petitioner along with his wife and children and further that Police took pity on the wife and children of the Petitioner and left him after admonishing him, without booking any case against him which all amounts to misconduct on the part of the

Petitioner which prejudiced interest of the bank and customers losing faith in the bank and complaining of the same.

17. As can be gathered from the material on the record, while meeting this charge, the Petitioner has submitted during the departmental enquiry at page No. 5 of the defence that "It is reported in the press and also by some members of public, that the incident has happened as described in the chargesheet issued to me. I agree that the News item published in the Eenadu daily confirms the statement of the charges referred in the chargesheet. I do not have any knowledge about the same as I was undergoing treatment for hypertension and was sometimes taking drugs of sedative nature. However, I wish to submit that I am never in the habit of betting. Hence, I am not able to say anything beyond this in this matter. In view of my explanation, I appeal to you to kindly close the enquiry."

18. But, Petitioner has evidently not produced any medical reports which can show that he was taking any drugs which are of sedative in nature, on any medical prescription. Further more, the Branch Manager, who is examined as MW2 has specifically stated that when a Police Constable was sent to him by the Police requiring his presence at Police station, he was constrained to go there and that there, he found the Petitioner along with his wife and children and further that the Circle Inspector admonished the Petitioner and then let him off. Thus, the Branch Manager who complained of this incident has substantiated the same. It is for the Petitioner to explain the circumstances which lead the police to apprehend him. He failed to do so. On the other hand, he is questioning the correctness of the evidence adduced on record for the Management in this regard stating that there is no FIR registered by the police. It is the specific evidence of the Branch Manager as MW2 that the Police have let off the Petitioner without registering any crime on humanitarian grounds and after due admonition. In such case the question of registration of FIR does not arise.

19. The above discussed material on record does clearly establish that the departmental enquiry was duly conducted without any violation of principles of natural justice and further that the findings arrived at by the Enquiry Officer are not perverse in any manner. They are all well reasoned findings given appreciating the evidence adduced on record and in consideration of the the contentions of both the Management and the defence. Thus, they do not warrant any interference.

20. Learned Counsel for the Petitioner relied upon the principles laid down in the case of Chandrakumar Madhukar Deshmukh Vs. The Board of Trustees of Port of Bombay 1995 LAB.I.C.1496, in support of his

contention that hearsay evidence can not be relied upon and that the findings of the Enquiry Officer are therefore, to be appropriately dealt with. In this case, the evidence relied upon by the Enquiry Officer is not hearsay evidence. The direct evidence of the Branch Manager on MW2 who has spoken of the incidents which occurred in his presence, has been relied upon.

21. The principles laid down in the case of Ghanshyam Das Shrivastava, Vs. State of Madhya Pradesh relied upon by the Petitioner are also not helpful to him since he participated in the departmental enquiry.

22. Considering the grave nature of misconduct of the Petitioner complained off and proved, the Respondent bank which is a financial institution and which functions on the faith of the public has chosen to dispense with the services of the Petitioner by dismissing him from the Bank's service. The same can not be fault with.

23. Thus, the action of the Management of Karur Vysya Bank Limited, Karur in dismissing the Petitioner from service with effect from 14.12.2002 is justified.

This point is answered accordingly.

#### **24. Point No. II:**

In view of the finding given in Point No. I, the Petitioner is not entitled for any relief.

#### **Result:**

In the result, the reference is answered as under:

The action of the Management of Karur Vysya Bank Limited, Karur in dismissing from the services of Sh. S.V.S. Sarma, Ex-Clerk-cum-Cashier, Dharmavaram Branch with effect from 14.12.2002 is justified and the said workman is not entitled for any relief.

Award passed accordingly. Transmit.

Dictated to Smt. P. Phani Gowri, Personal Assistant transcribed by her and corrected by me on this the 28th day of February, 2014.

M. VIJAYA LAKSHMI, Presiding Officer

#### **Appendix of evidence**

Witnesses examined for the Petitioner	Witnesses examined for the Respondent
---	---

NIL

NIL

NIL

#### **Documents Marked for the Petitioner**

NIL

#### **Documents marked for the Respondent**

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 25 अपैल, 2014

का० आ० 1336.— औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार स्टेट बैंक ऑफ हैदराबाद प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच

अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण हैदराबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 11/2007) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 16/04/2014 प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल.-12012/96/2006-आई आर (बी-1)]  
सुमिति सकलानी, अनुभाग अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 25th April, 2014

**S.O. 1336.**—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. 11/2007) of the Cent. Govt. Indus. Tribuna-cum-Labour Court, Hyderabad as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of State Bank of Hyderabad and their workmen, received by the Central Government on 16/04/2014.

[No. L-12012/96/2006-IR(B-I)]  
SUMATI SAKLANI, Section Officer

#### ANNEXURE

#### BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD

**PRESENT :** SMT. M. VIJAYALAKSHMI, Presiding Officer

Dated the 28th day of January, 2014

#### INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE NO. I.D. 11/2007

#### BETWEEN:

Sri L. Pavan Kumar,  
R/o H.No. 5-11-183/1, Coolie Lane,  
Venkatappaiah Veedhi,  
Kothagudem-507101.  
Distt. Khammam. ....Petitioner

#### AND

The Dy. General Manager,  
State Bank of Hyderabad,  
Gunfoundry, Hyderabad-500 001. ....Respondent

#### APPEARANCES:

For the Petitioner : M/s. A. Sarojana & K. Vasudeva Reddy, Advocates

For the Respondent : M/s. Ch. Shiva Reddy & T.G. Prasad Reddy, Advocates

#### AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. L-12012/96/2006-IR(B-I) dated 22.7.2007

referred the following dispute between the management of M/s. Singareni Collieries Company Ltd., and their workman under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 for adjudication to this Tribunal. The reference is,

#### SCHEDULE

Whether the action the management of State Bank of Hyderabad, Hyderabad (A.P.) in terminating the services of Sri L. Pavan Kumar, Casual Worker *w.e.f.* 20.10.2005 without following the provisions of Section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is proper and justified? If not, to what relief the workman concerned is entitled?"

The reference is numbered in this Tribunal as I.D. No. 11/2007 and notices were issued to the parties.

2. The case stands posted for cross examination to Petitioner by the Respondent.

3. While so, a letter has been received through post purporting to be that of the Petitioner stating that Petitioner is withdrawing the case. Petitioner's counsel reported that he got no response from the Petitioner when he has contacted regarding the letter addressed by him to the Court. Petitioner called absent. In the circumstances, taking that Petitioner got no interest in the proceedings, 'Nil' award is passed.

Award passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. P. Phani Gowri, Personal Assistant, corrected by me on this the 28th day of January, 2014.

M. VIJAYA LAKSHMI, Presiding Officer

#### Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the Petitioner	Witnesses examined for the Respondent
NIL	NIL

#### Documents Marked for the Petitioner

NIL

#### Documents marked for the Respondent

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 25 अप्रैल, 2014

का० आ० 1337.—ओद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार स्टेट बैंक ऑफ हैदराबाद के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, हैदराबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या एल सी 72/2006 एवं 15/2007) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 16/04/2014 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल.-12012/21/2006-आई आर (बी-1)]

सुमिति सकलानी, अनुभाग अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 25th April, 2014

**S.O. 1337.**—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (No. LC 72/2006 & ID 15/2007) of the Cent. Govt. Indus. Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Hyderabad as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of State Bank of Hyderabad and their workmen, received by the Central Government on 16/04/2014.

[No. L-12012/21/2006-IR(B-I)]  
SUMATI SAKLANI, Section Officer

#### ANNEXURE

#### BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIALTRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD

**PRESENT:** SMT. M. VIJAYA LAKSHMI, Presiding Officer

Dated the 28th day of February, 2014  
**COMMONAWARD**  
**IN**  
**INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE Nos.**  
**L.C. 72/2006 and ID. 15/2007**

#### BETWEEN:

Shri B. Ashok Kumar  
S/o B. Mallaiah,  
C/o A.P. Industrial Employees Union,  
"House of Labour", King Kothi Road,  
Hyderabad - 29 .....Petitioner

#### AND

1. The Dy. General Manager,  
Personnel Department,  
State Bank of Hyderabad,  
Gunfoundry, Head Office,  
Hyderabad.
2. The Branch Manager,  
State Bank of Hyderabad,  
Nallakunta Branch,  
Nallakunta,  
Hyderabad. ....Respondents

#### APPEARANCES:

For the Petitioner : M/s. V. Viswanatham & R.  
Dushyantla, Advocates

For the Respondent : Sri A.V.S.S. Prasad, Advocate

#### COMMON AWARD

Sri B. Ashok Kumar invoking Sec.2A(2) of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (who will be referred to

as workman) has filed this petition against the Respondents seeking for passing an award directing the Respondent to reinstate the Petitioner into service from 10.10.2005 with full back wages and all other attendant benefits with continuity of service and to pay interest @ 12% p.a. on the back wages and costs.

2. While so a reference in ID. No. 15/2007 has been received by this forum from Government of India, Ministry of Labour and Employment, New Delhi *vide* order No. L-12012/21/2006-IR(B-I) date 19.1.2007, whereunder, this forum has been invited to give award on the question of,

"Whether the action of the management of State Bank of Hyderabad, not regularising the services of Sri. B. Ashok Kumar, Casual Labour, working since 1994 is legal and justified? If not, what relief the workman is entitled to?"

By virtue of the order dated 30.09.2008, these two cases *i.e.*, LC 72/2006 and ID 15/2007 were clubbed together and the proceedings were conducted commonly for both there matters in LC 72/2006.

3. No. specific claim statyement has been filed by the Petitioner in ID 15/2007.

#### 4. The averments made in LC /2006 filed by the Petitioner in brief are follows:

Petitioner was appointed by the 2nd Respondent with the consent and permission of the 1st Respondent from June, 1994 as casual labour and his las drawn wages was Rs.50/- per day, whereas casual labours working at Gunfoundry Branch and Kakatiyanagar Branch are being paid wages @ Rs. 130 per deay. Petitioner was pleading since long time that he was being paid less wages. He worked with the Respondent continuously but as per their usual practice no written orders were issued. He was never engaged in the exigencies of the work as and when necessary and was never paid same amount as per the work without hindrance he entered into he entered into the bank along with the regular employees and performed duties entrusted to him by the 2nd Respondent. But he was deprived equal pay for equal work. He completed 240 days in everycalendar year. He used to work from 10 AM to 11.30 P.M. to help and assist and staff in finalizing the work, after banking hours. 2nd Respondent appreciated his work and in they year 1998 forwarded the proposals to Asst. General Manager vide letter No. 163 dated 28.8.1998 recommending the name of the Petition. In the year 2001 also 2nd Respondent recommended the name of the Petitioner for appointment on consolidated wages *vide* reference No. F/23 dated 19.4.2001. The Dy. General Manager and Asst. General Manager of the Regional Office also have recommended the same of the Petitioner to the first

Respondent *vide* their letter dated 8.6.2001 2nd Respondent recommended to the Asst. General Manager for absorption on consolidated wages as he is well versed with the bank and duties. These documents clearly show that there is no break in service of the Petitioner from 1994. Since services were not regularized inspite several representations though Respondent regularized services of several others without the medial of Employment Exchange. He approached his union who in turn raised a dispute under Sec. 2SCk for regularization before the Conciliation Officer, Assistant Labour Commissioner(C) who admitted the dispute and as the conciliation failed, he closed proceedings and submitted report to the government *vide* their letter 23.9.2005. Respondent not only paid less wages but also deprived the Petitioner of payment of bonus, whereas there are order in the shape of circular by the Respondents that the casual employees are netitled for the bonue. Having no alternative Petitioner filed MP 51/2005 claiming for difference of the amount due to him from 5.6.1994 to 4.10.2005 invoking Sec. 33C(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. In the circumstances 2nd Respondent with prejudiced mind has terminated the services of the Petitioner orally from 1.6.2006 by withholding the wages from 8.5.2006, which is unfair labour Practice. On such illegal termination Petitioner issued notice dated 2.6.2006 which the Respondents received but there is not response from him. Such oral termination of the Petitioner's service is illegal, inoperative and improper and without any valid reason. Petitioner has successfully completed continuous service from June, 1994 to 31.5.2006. Inspite of it Sec. 25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 was not followed. He is entitled for reinstatement into service. Hence, the petition.

**5. Respondents filed their common counter in LC 72/2006 and ID 15/2007, with the averments in brief as follows:**

A.P. Industrial Employee Union does not have any locus stand to file this case on behalf of the Petitioner, as it is neither an association recognized by the Bank nor having the employees of bank as members. Further Petitioner is not a workman as per Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. He is not an employee of the bank. As such, petition is liable to be dismissed. Further as per the verdict of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the case of Secretary, State of Karnataka and others (Vs) Umadevi and three others, reported in at (2006) 4 SCC page 1, casual labour/temporary employees do not have any right to regular or permanent public employment as they accepted the employment fully knowing the nature of their employment at their own violation and with eyes open as to the nature of their illegal employment, which is not as per constitutional provisions and the appointment is not as per due process of selection

as envisaged by the relevant rules and also held that the courts should not perpetuate illegalities, irregularities or improprieties. Thus, the petition under Section 2A(2) of Industrial Disputes Act 1947 is not maintainable in law or on facts. The contention of the Petitioner that he was employed on casual basis since 1994 by the 2nd Respondent and 2nd Respondent was making payment of Rs. 50 per day though the casual labours working in the other branches like Kakatiyanagar branch and Gunfoundry branch are being paid more wages, that Petitioner was working continuously without any break and competed 240 days in a calendar year, that he made request for written letter of appointment and for correct wages and was assured of the same and was not granted the same, that 2nd Respondent extracted the work from 10 A.M. to 11 P.M. without giving any break are all incorrect. Petitioner never worked for 240 day in a calendar year and he was never employed in the year 1994 not terminated on 1.6.2006. Payment of wages made to casual workers of Kakatiyanagar branch and Gunfoundry branch was covered by some order which were passed by competent court basing on the records. Placing the Petitioner with such persons stating that their respective cases are identical is incorrect and is not maintainable in Law and on facts. The present claim petition is filed as counter making claims which got nothing to the state of affairs concerning the Petitioner who is a daily employee and whose services were utilized as and when need arose is not at all correct. The documents relied upon by the Petitioner are self-serving and they are not official record of the bank. The mode and manner in which such documents were obtained is not made out. Notice for termination dated 2.6.2006 given by the Petitioner is an after thought with a mind set for filing the present petition Provisions of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 are not applicable to him as the Petitioner is not a permanent employee and since his claim that he successfully continued in service from June, 1994 to 31.5.2006 and that he was terminated on 1.6.2006 are all incorrect. He was engaged on casual basis as and when work arose, in the branch due to various reasons. His claim that his services were terminated to harass him as he approached courts is far from truth and it is an attempt to abuse due process of law. He was never appointed by the bank of appointment letter was issued to him. He was paid as per the norms and understanding of the work done. He was engaged to do the work which is casual in nature and which arises intermittently. For doing regular work bank recruits staff by complying with the provisions stipulated after taking into account the guidelines issued by the Government of India from time to time in accordance with constitutional provisions. As such, employment itself is illegal. Therefore, the reinstatement into service can not be claimed that too with full back wages and attendant

benefits with continuity of service and also interest. Government of India, Ministry of Finance, Department of Economic Affairs (Banking Division) had issued circular dated 6.8.1990 directing the recruitment of temporary employee in the clerical/subordinate cadre shall be stopped forthwith. For the staff which was then on the rolls of the banks, they shall be regularized as provided in the approach paper in terms of the circular issued at that time. These are all specific directions of Banks to make temporary appointment till the problem of existing temporary employees is fully resolved and for future requirement, Banks would have to approach Government and would have go by such modalities as would be laid down by the Government through regular process of recruitment enshrined in the constitution. Engagement of Petitioner is illegal because such appointment on casual basis were obtained by the Petitioner without following the procedure of their names being forwarded by the Employment Exchange, without following the rule of reservation and the procedure for appointment of employees in the subordinate cadre as prescribed by the rules of the Respondent bank. Further, as per the verdict of Hon'ble Supreme Court the candidates lack any eligibility of qualification in any manner it would not possible to consider for regularization as casual labours and that long duration of service would also not be relevant condition to regularize the service. Appointment against non-existent vacancy is also not maintainable and such person is not entitled for regularization. In this case there was no vacancy in the regular basis but the Petitioner was engaged on daily wages basis to meet the exigencies. Even such employment can not be regularized unless regularized through prescribed procedure. Daily wage labourers whose services were engaged on the basis of need of work, such termination does not constitute as retrenchment. Such termination is not arbitrary as they are need based. It is well settled principle that an appointment made in violation of mandatory provisions constituted and non-possession of minimum educational or technical qualifications and other essential qualification etc., would be wholly illegal. Those who come by back door should go through the door. Since Petitioner has been engaged to meet the exigencies only he is not a workman and he is not entitled for equal emoluments or equal pay to that of regular employees. Regularization can not be claimed as a matter of right, especially when it is illegal appointment. Petition is liable to be dismissed with exemplary costs.

6. To substantiate the contentions of the Petitioner WW1 was examined and ExW1 to W6 were marked Ex. W1 is the sanction letter for the posts of part time employees dated 14.6.06. Ex. W2 is the proposal for the post of part time employees on consolidated wages dated 19.4.2001. Ex. W3 is the recommendation letter from the Bank

Manager dated 8.6.2001. Ex. W4 is the proposal for the sanction of part time employee on consolidated wages. Ex. W5 is the list of the casual employees who were regularized. Ex. W6 is the representation dated 2.6.06 to the Branch Manager and the Dy. General Manager Personnel Department. On behalf of the management MWq was examined. No documentary evidence has been produced by the management.

7. Heard the arguments of the either party. Written arguments were also filed by the Petitioner and the same are received and considered.

#### **8. Point that arises for determination is:**

whether the Petitioner is workman and whether termination of his services is legal and justified? If so, to what relief the Petitioner is entitled?

#### **9. Point**

As far as the present dispute is concerned, Ex. W1 and W4 are relevant and Ex. W5 and W6 are not much relevant. Through Ex. W1 and W4 coupled with his own oral evidence as WW1, Petitioner could establish before this court that he has been working as casual labour with the Respondent bank since June, 1994. Sri Mallela Srinivas, Chief Manager of the Respondent bank who has examined as MW1 could not deny regarding the correspondence i.e., Ex. W1 and W4 when they were confronted to him. Thus, it can safely be taken that Petitioner has worked with the Respondent bank since June, 1994 as casual labour and therefore, he is a workman for all purposes. Contra contentions of the Respondent are not acceptable.

10. As can be gathered from the material on record, Petitioner who applied for his absorption in bank's regular service by making applications time and again and whose case has been recommended by the then Branch Manager, as can be gathered from Ex. W1 and W4, has raised an industrial dispute seeking for regularization of his service with the Respondent bank by approaching Assistant Labour Commissioner (C). Assistant Labour Commissioner (C) has made efforts to conciliate the matter, and evidently such conciliation proceedings failed.

11. While things stood so, instead of regularising the Petitioner's service, the Respondent bank has chosen to remove him from service abruptly *w.e.f.* 1.6.2006. There no Petitioner is constrained to approach this forum by filing this dispute seeking for his reinstatement into service.

12. Evidently and admittedly there is no compliance of Sec. 25F of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, while removing the Petitioner from service. It is the contention of the Respondent that since the Petitioner is not a workman and Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 does not apply to him, there was no compliance of Sec. 25F of

Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

13. As already observed above, the material record clearly discloses that Petitioner has been in continuous service as casual labour with the Respondent since June, 1994 and thus he is a workman. Thus, the provisions of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 will apply to him, therefore, his retrenchment/removal from service without complying with Sec. 25F of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is certainly illegal, unjust and arbitrary.

14. It is the contention of the Respondent that the principles laid down in the cases of Official Liquidator Vs. Dayanand and others (2008) 10 SCC page 1 whereunder principles laid down in the case of Umadevi Vs. State of Karnataka(2006) 4 SCC page 1 has been upheld, as applicable to the present case and that Petitioner is not entitled for the relief sought for.

15. In the above cited cases Hon'ble Supreme Court has considered the acceptable mode of public employment and non acceptable regularization of services of the persons who entered into the service by back door methods, thereby defeating the opportunity of the general public to compete for appointment to the said post etc.. Present dispute is an industrial dispute. Industrial Law is totally different from Civil Law/Administrative Law. Regularization of casual workman as regular workman etc., are all governed by the industrial Laws, rules and various circulars issued by the government from time to time touching this aspects. Public employment under Civil Law/Administrative Law is totally different.

16. Further more, in this case Petitioner is not seeking for regularization of his services. What all he is questioning is the correctness of abrupt termination of his services when he questioned the inaction on the part of the Respondent bank regarding his plea for regularization of his services, that too without complying with the Sec. 25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

17. Inspite of their own admission in their counter that "Government of India, Ministry of Finance, Department of Economic Affairs (Banking Division) had issued a circular No. F-3/3/104/87-IR dated 6.8.1990, directing that all recruitment of temporary employees in the clerical/subordinate cadre shall be stopped forth with and that for the staff which was then on the rolls of the Banks, they shall be regularized as provided in the approach paper in terms of the circular issued at that time." the Respondent Bank, evidently failed to take appropriate action, in connection with the claims of the Petitioner.

18. Anyway, the question whether Petitioner is entitled for regularization of services or not is not the subject matter in this petition. Even if the same is subject matter in this petition, since it is an industrial dispute, the principles laid down in the above cited cases are not applicable.

19. For all the above referred reasons, the principles laid down in the above cited cases relied upon by the Learned Counsels for the bank are not helpful to his contention in this case.

20. There are umpteen number of legal precedents laid down by the Apex Court whereunder it is clearly laid down that the workman who is removed from service without complying with the mandatory conditions laid down in Sec. 25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is to be ordered to be reinstated into service. Thus, the Petitioner, who is found to be a workman, is entitled to be reinstated into service of the bank *w.e.f.* 1.6.2006 with the benefit of continuous service. As far as back wages are concerned, since he did not render his service to the bank, but not due to his own fault, he is entitled for atleast 50% of the back wages which he would have earned but for his removal from service.

This point is answered accordingly.

**Result:**

In the result, petition is allowed. Petitioner shall be reinstated into service of the Respondent bank as casual labour *w.e.f.* 1.6.2006 with continuity of service. He shall be paid 50% of the back wages also, forth with.

Award passed accordingly. Transmit.

Dictated to Smt. P. Phani Gowri, Personal Assistant transcribed by her corrected by me on this the 28th day of February, 2014.

M.VIJAYA LAKSHMI, Presiding Officer

**Appendix of evidence**

Witnesses examined for the Petitioner	Witnesses examined for the Respondent
WW1: Sri B. Ashok Kumar	MW1: Sri Mallela Srinivas

**Documents marked for the Petitioner**

- Ex. W1: Photostat copy of the 1r. No. 163 dt. 20/8/98 to the Asst. General Manager by Branch Manager, Nallakunta
- Ex. W2: Photostat copy of the 1r. No. F/23 dt. 19/4/2001 to the Asst. General Manager by Branch Manager, Nallakunta
- Ex. W3: Photostat copy of the 1r. dated 8.6.2001 to the DGM, from the Asst. General Manager

Ex.W4: Photostat copy of the 1r. No. to the Asst. General Manager by the Chief Manager, Nallakunta

Ex.W5: Photostat copy of list of the 34 casual employees of the State Bank of Hyderabad.

Ex.W6: Photostat copy of representation dt. 2.6.2006 by the Petitioner to the DGM, Personnel Department and Branch Manager, Nallakunta branch

#### **Documents marked for the Respondent**

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 29 अप्रैल, 2014

का०आ० 1338.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 91-क के साथ पठित धारा 88 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए सेल के भिलाई स्टील प्लांट के कारखानों/स्थापनाओं के नियमित कर्मचारियों को इस अधिनियम के प्रवर्तन से छूट प्रदान करती है। यह छूट, इस अधिसूचना के जारी होने की तारीख से एक वर्ष की अवधि के लिए लागू रहेगी।

2. उक्त छूट निम्नलिखित शर्तों के अधीन है; अर्थात्:-

- (1) पूर्वोक्त स्थापना जिसमें कर्मचारी नियोजित हैं, एक रजिस्टर रखेंगी, जिसमें छूट प्राप्त कर्मचारियों के नाम और पदनाम दिखाये जायेंगे;
- (2) इस छूट के होते हुए भी, कर्मचारी उक्त अधिनियम के अधीन ऐसी प्रसुविधाएं प्राप्त करते रहेंगे जिनकों पाने के लिए वे इस अधिसूचना द्वारा दी गई छूट के प्रवृत्त होने की तारीख से पूर्व संदर्भ अंशदानों के आधार पर हकदार हो जाते हैं;
- (3) छूट प्राप्त अवधि के लिए, यदि कोई अभिदाय पहले ही किए जा चुके हों, तो वे वापस नहीं किए जाएंगे;
- (4) उक्त कारखाने/स्थापना का नियोजक उस अवधि की बाबत जिसके दौरान उस कारखाने/स्थापना पर उक्त अधिनियम (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त अवधि कहा गया है) प्रवर्तमान था ऐसी विवरणियां, ऐसे प्रारूप में और ऐसी विशिष्टियों सहित देगा जो कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा (साधारण) विनियम, 1950 के अधीन उसे उक्त अवधि की बाबत देनी अपेक्षित होती थीं;
- (5) निगम द्वारा उक्त कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम की धारा 45 की उप-धारा (1) के अधीन नियुक्त किया गया कोई सामाजिक सुरक्षा अधिकारी या निगम का इस निमित्त प्राधिकृत कोई अन्य पदधारी;

- (i) धारा 44 की उप-धारा (1) के अधीन, उक्त अवधि की बाबत दी गई किसी विवरण की विशिष्टियों को सत्यापित करने के प्रयोजनार्थ; अथवा
- (ii) यह अभिनिश्चित करने के प्रयोजनार्थ कि कर्मचारी राज्य

बीमा (साधारण) विनियम, 1950 द्वारा यथाअपेक्षित रजिस्टर और अभिलेख उक्त अवधि के लिए रखे गये थे या नहीं; या

(iii) यह अभिनिश्चित करने के प्रयोजनार्थ के कर्मचारी, नियोजक द्वारा दिये गए उन फायदों को, जिसके फलस्वरूप इस अधिसूचना के अधीन छूट दी जा रही है, नकद में और वस्तु रूप में पाने का हकदार बना हुआ है या नहीं; या

(iv) यह अभिनिश्चित करने के प्रयोजनार्थ के उस अवधि के दौरान, जब उक्त कारखाने के संबंध में अधिनियम के उपबंध प्रवृत्त थे, ऐसे किन्हीं उपबंधों का अनुपालन किया गया था या नहीं, निम्नलिखित कार्य करने के लिए सशक्त होगा:-

(क) प्रधान या आसन्न नियोजक से अपेक्षा करना कि वह उसे ऐसी जानकारी दे जिसे उपरोक्त अधिकारी या अन्य पदधारी इस अधिनियम के प्रयोजनार्थ आवश्यक समझता है; अथवा

(ख) ऐसे प्रधान या आसन्न नियोजक के अधिभोगा-धीन, किसी कारखाने, स्थापना, कार्यालय या अन्य परिसर में किसी भी उचित समय पर प्रवेश करना और उसके प्रभारी से यह अपेक्षा करना कि वह व्यक्तियों के नियोजन और मजदूरी के संदाय से संबंधित ऐसे लेखा, बहियां और अन्य दस्तावेज, ऐसे निरीक्षक या अन्य पदधारी के समक्ष प्रस्तुत करें और उनकी परीक्षा करने दें या ऐसी जानकारी दें जिसे वे आवश्यक समझते हैं; या

(ग) प्रधान या आसन्न नियोजक की, उसके अभिकर्ता या सेवक की, या ऐसे किसी व्यक्ति को, जो ऐसे कारखाने, स्थापना, कार्यालय या अन्य परिसर में पाया जाए, यह विश्वास करने का युक्तियुक्त कारण है कि वह कर्मचारी है, परीक्षा करना; या

(घ) ऐसे कारखाने, स्थापना, कार्यालय या अन्य परिसर में रखे गए किसी रजिस्टर, लेखा, बही या अन्य दस्तावेज की नकल तैयार करने या उद्धरण लेना;

(ङ.) यथानिर्धारित अन्य शक्तियों को प्रयोग करना।

6. विनिवेश/निगमीकरण के मामले में, प्रदत्त छूट स्वतः रद्द हो जाएगी और तब नए प्रतिष्ठान को छूट हेतु समुचित सरकार की अनुमति लेनी होगी।

[सं. एस-38014/7/2013-एसएस-I]

अजय मलिक, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 29th April, 2014

**S.O. 1338.**—In exercise of the power conferred by Section 88 read with Section 91-A of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948) the Central Government hereby exempts the regular employees of factories/establishment of Bhilai Steel Plant of SAIL from the operation of the said Act. The exemption shall be effective from the date of issue of notification for a period of one year.

2. The above exemption is subject to the following conditions namely:

- (1) The aforesaid establishments wherein the employees are employed shall maintain a register showing the name and designations of the exempted employees;
- (2) Notwithstanding this exemption, the employees shall continue to receive such benefits under the said Act to which they might have become entitled to on the basis of the contributions paid period to the date from which exemption granted by this notification operates;
- (3) The contributions of the exempted period, if already paid, shall not be refundable;
- (4) The employer of the said factory/establishment shall submit in respect of period during which that factory was subject to the operation of the said Act (hereinafter referred as the said period), such returns in such forms and containing such particulars as were due from it in respect of the said period under the Employees' State Insurance (General) Regulations, 1950;
- (5) Any Social Security Officer appointed by the Corporation under Sub-Section (1) of Section 45 of the said ESI Act or other Official of the Corporation authorized in this behalf by it, shall, for the purpose of:
  - (i) Verifying the particulars contained in any returned submitted under sub-section (1) Section 44 for the said period; or
  - (ii) Ascertaining whether registers and records were maintained as required by the Employees' State Insurance (General) Regulations, 1950 for the said period; or
  - (iii) Ascertaining whether the employees continue to be entitled to benefits provided by the employer in cash and kind being benefits in consideration of which exemption is being granted under this notification; or
  - (iv) Ascertaining whether any of the provisions of the Act had been complied with during the

period when such provisions were in force in relation to the said factory to be empowered to:—

- (a) require the principal or immediate employer to him such information as he may consider necessary for the purpose of this Act; or
- (b) at any reasonable time enter any factory, establishment, officer or other premises occupied by such principal or immediate employer at any reasonable time and require any persons found in charge thereof to produce to such inspector or other official and allow him to examine accounts, books and other documents relating to the employment of personal and payment of wages or to furnish to him such information as he may consider necessary; or
- (c) examine the principal or immediate employer, his agent or servant, or any person found in such factory, establishment, office or other premises or any person whom the said inspector or other official has reasonable cause to believe to have been an employee; or
- (d) make copies of or take extracts from any register, account book or other document maintained in such factory, establishment, office or other premises;
- (e) exercise such other powers as may be prescribed.

(6) In case of disinvestment/corporatization, the exemption granted shall become automatically cancelled and the new entity will have to approach the appropriate Government for exemption.

[No. S-38014/7/2013-SS-I]

AJAY MALIK, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 29 अप्रैल, 2014

**का.आ. 1339.—**केन्द्रीय सरकार, कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 91-के साथ पठित धारा 88 द्वारा प्रदत शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए स्टील ऑर्थोरिटी ऑफ इंडिया लिमिटेड के सैन्यल मार्केटिंग ऑर्गेनाइजेसन के कारखानों/स्थापनाओं के नियमित कर्मचारियों को इस अधिनियम के प्रवर्तन से छूट प्रदान करती है। यह छूट, इस अधिसूचना के जारी होने की तारीख से एक वर्ष की अवधि के लिए लागू होगी।

2. उक्त छूट निम्नलिखित शर्तों के अधीन है; अर्थात्:-

- (1) पूर्वाक्त स्थापना जिसमें कर्मचारी नियोजित हैं, एक रजिस्टर रखेगी, जिसमें छूट प्राप्त कर्मचारियों के नाम और पदनाम दिखाए जाएंगे;
- (2) इस छूट के होते हुए भी, कर्मचारी उक्त अधिनियम के अधीन ऐसी प्रसुविधाएं प्राप्त करते रहेंगे जिनको पाने के लिए वे इस अधिसूचना द्वारा दी गई छूट के प्रवृत्त होने की तारीख से पूर्व संदर्भ अंशदानों के आधार पर हकदार हो जाते हैं;
- (3) छूट प्राप्त अवधि के लिए, यदि कोई अभिदाय पहले ही किए जा चुके हों, तो वे वापस नहीं किए जाएंगे;
- (4) उक्त कारखाने/स्थापना का नियोजक उस अवधि की बाबत जिसके दौरान उस कारखाने/स्थापना पद उक्त अधिनियम (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त अवधि कहा गया है) प्रवर्तमान था ऐसी विवरणियां, ऐसे प्रारूप में और ऐसी विशिष्टियों सहित देगा जो कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा (साधारण) विनियम, 1950 के अधीन उसे उक्त अवधि की बाबत देनी अपेक्षित होती थीं;
- (5) निगम द्वारा उक्त कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम की धारा 45 की उप-धारा (1) के अधीन नियुक्त किया गया कोई सामाजिक सुरक्षा अधिकारी या निगम का इस निमित प्राधिकृत कोई अन्य पदधारी;

- (i) धारा 44 की उप-धारा (1) के अधीन, उक्त अवधि की बाबत दी गई किसी विवरण की विशिष्टियों को सत्यापित करने के प्रयोजनार्थ; अथवा
- (ii) यह अभिनिश्चित करने के प्रयोजनार्थ कि कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा (साधारण) विनियम, 1950 द्वारा यथाअपेक्षित रजिस्टर और अभिलेखा एक्ट अवधि के लिए रखे गए थे या नहीं; या
- (iii) यह अभिनिश्चित करने के प्रयोजनार्थ कि कर्मचारी, नियोजक द्वारा दिए गए उन फायदों को, जिसके फलस्वरूप इस अधिसूचना के अधीन छूट दी जा रही है, नकद में और वस्तु रूप में पाने का हकदार बना हुआ है या नहीं; या
- (vi) यह अभिनिश्चित करने के प्रयोजनार्थ कि उस अवधि के दौरान, जब उक्त कारखाने के संबंध में अधिनियम के उपबंध प्रवृत्त थे, ऐसे किन्हीं उपबंधों का अनुपालन किया गया था या नहीं, निम्नलिखित कार्य करने के सशक्त होगा:-

(क) प्रधान या आसन्न नियोजक से अपेक्षा करना कि वह उसे ऐसी जानकारी दे जिसे उपरोक्त अधिकारी या अन्य पदधारी इस अधिनियम के प्रयोजनार्थ आवश्यक समझता है; अथवा

(ख) ऐसे प्रधान या आसन्न नियोजक के अधिभोगा-धीन, किसी कारखाने, स्थापना, कार्यालय या अन्य परिसर में किसी भी उचित समय पर प्रवेश करना और उसके प्रभारी से यह अपेक्षा करना कि वह व्यक्तियों के नियोजन और मजदूरी के संदाय से संबंधित ऐसे लेखा, बहियां और अन्य दस्तावेज, ऐसे निरिक्षक या अन्य पदधारी के समक्ष प्रस्तुत करें और उनकी परीक्षा करने दें या ऐसी जानकारी दें जिसे वे आवश्यक समझते हैं; या

(ग) प्रधान या आसन्न नियोजक की, उसके अधिकर्ता या सेवक की, या ऐसे किसी व्यक्ति को, जो ऐसे कारखाने, स्थापना, कार्यालय या अन्य परिसर में पाया जाए, यह विश्वास करने का युक्तियुक्त कारण है कि वह कर्मचारी है, परीक्षा करना; या

(घ) ऐसे कारखाने, स्थापना, कार्यालय या अन्य परिसर में रखे गए किसी रजिस्टर, लेखा, बही या अन्य दस्तावेज की नकल तैयार करना या उद्धरण लेना;

(ङ) यथानिर्धारित अन्य शक्तियों का प्रयोग करना।

6. विनिवेश /निगमीकरण के मामले में, प्रदत्त छूट स्वतः रद्द हो जाएगी और तब नए प्रतिष्ठान की छूट हेतु समुचित सरकार की अनुमति लेनी होगी।

[सं. एस-38014/2/2014-एस.एस-I]

अजय मलिक, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 29th April, 2014

**S.O. 1339.**—In exercise of the power conferred by Section 88 read with Section 91-A of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948) of the Central Government hereby exempts the regular employees of factories/establishments of Central Marketing Organisation of Steel Authority of India Ltd. from the operation of the said Act. The Exemption shall be effective from the date of issue of notification for a period of one year.

2. The above exemption is subject to the following conditions namely:-

- (1) The aforesaid establishments wherein the employees are employed shall maintain a register showing the name and designations of the exempted employees';
- (2) Not notwithstanding this exemption, the employees shall continue to receive such benefits under the said Act to which they might have become entitled to on the basis of the contributions paid prior to the date from which exemption granted by this notification operates;

(3) The contributions for the exempted period, of already paid, shall not be refundable;

(4) The employer of the said factory/establishment shall submit in respect of the period during which that factory was subject to the operation of the said Act (hereinafter referred as the said period), such returns in such forms and containing such particulars as were due from it in respect of the said period under the Employees' State Insurance (General) Regulations, 1950;

(5) Any Social Security Officer appointed by the Corporation under sub-section (1) of section 45 of the said ESI Act or other Official of the Corporation authorized in this behalf by it, shall, for the purpose of:-

- (i) Verifying the particulars contained in any returned submitted under-sub-section (1) of Section 44 for the said period; or
- (ii) Ascertaining whether registers and records were maintained as required by the Employees' State Insurance (General) Regulations, 1950 for the said period; or
- (iii) Ascertaining whether the employees continue to be entitled to benefits provided by the employer in cash and kind being benefits in consideration of which exemption is being granted under this notification; or
- (iv) Ascertaining whether any of the provisions of the Act had been complied with during the period when such provisions were in force in relation to the said factory to be empowered to:-

(a) require the principal or immediate employer to him such information as he may consider necessary for the purpose of this Act; or

(b) at any reasonable time enter any factory, establishment, office or other premises occupied by such principal or immediate employer at any reasonable time and require any person found in charge thereof to produce to such inspector or other official and allow him to examine accounts, books and other documents relating to the employment of personal and payment of wages or to furnish to him such information as he may consider necessary; or

(c) examine the principal or immediate employer, his agent or servant, or any person found in such factory, establishment, office or other premises or any person whom the said inspector or other official has reasonable cause to believe to have been an employee; or

(d) make copies of or take extracts from any register, account book or other document maintained in such factory, establishment, office or other premises,

(e) exercise such other power as may be prescribed.

(6) In case of disinvestment/corporatization, the exemption granted shall become automatically cancelled and then the new entity will have to approach the appropriate Government for exemption.

[No. S-38014/2/2014-SS-I]

AJAY MALIK, Under Secy.